

Also, petition of citizens of Edinburg, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from citizens of Hampden, N. Dak., urging passage of bill for additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Ledyard Grange, No. 167, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mystic, Conn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of farmers of Kewaunee County, Wis., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Suring, Wis., in favor of the withdrawal of United States troops from the Mexican frontier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of residents of Door County, Wis., favoring retention of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Augustus Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of residents and voters of Henrico County, Va., in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, against Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of Hugh Bell and 43 others, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of New York Cordage Co., against the duty on jute cotton bagging and russla rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNBULL: Petition of Edward Wyatt, son of E. A. R. Wyatt, asking for remuneration for property taken by and for the use of the Union Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of Seward Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and Stereotypers' Union No. 1, Journeymen Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, of New York, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Chapter of American Institute of Architects, favoring proposed site for Lincoln memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 13, 1911.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, whose ear is ever open to the cry of Thy children, we are sore pained because of the homes which have been devastated and the hearts which have been made desolate. Their sorrow is our sorrow, as their loss is our loss. Oh, Thou who rulest over whirlwind and tempest, comfort the stricken hearts, we pray Thee, and deepen Thy children's trust in Thee. And though Thou leadest us in ways which we can not understand, because of the frailty of our nature, help us still, we implore Thee, to pray that Thy will may be done and that Thy kingdom may come. And unto Thee, who art the God of all comfort, do we commit our bodies and our souls now and forevermore. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 43.

Whereas it appears from an investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under the Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and control its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of the bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

Adopted February 16, 1911.

N. BAXTER, Jr.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 17, 1911.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. HOOPER, Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregations of the Temple Lutheran Church, of Philadelphia; the Church of the Brethren, of Portis, Kans.; the Church of the Brethren, of St. Joseph, Mo.; of the Morning Star Sunday School, of McPherson, Kans.; and of the executive committee of the Laymen's Missionary Movement of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict the sale and traffic of opium, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Emerald Club, of Paterson, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of Kankakee, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dunlap, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota Wool Growers' Association, praying for the adoption of an amendment to Schedule K of the present tariff law providing reasonable protection to the wool growers of the Mississippi Valley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of the Morning Star Sunday School, of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented petitions of James Collins, of Manchester, N. H., and 254 other citizens of New Hampshire, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented memorials of Herman Anderson, of Milan; C. W. Farr, of North Weare; William Chesbro, of East Deer- ing; J. W. Clark, of North Weare; William F. Colesworthy, of Canaan; Fred O. Lavene, of Winchester; Edward Flanders, of Clinton Grove; Edgar C. Breed, of Weare; Oliver C. Dimond, of West Concord; S. R. Hanscom, of Errol; Fred A. Wesson, of Lancaster; Gaun E. Gonell, of Tilton; and John D. Hutchinson, of West Chesterfield, all of the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the Salt Lake Socialist Party, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. I present a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent:

The Bay of Port Townsend and Oak Bay, in the State of Washington, are now separated by a narrow strip of land from 100 to 150 feet in width, and by reason of this obstruction vessels going north from Puget Sound are compelled to pass around Marrowstone Point, exposed to the heavy swells direct from the ocean. We would further represent that light-draft and stern-wheel steamers are forbidden by the United States local inspectors from doing business between the city of Port Townsend and other cities on Puget Sound south of Marrowstone Point during the winter months. We would further represent that the removal of this obstruction would present a safe means of communication during the entire year, and also shorten the distance to be traveled by water at least 12 miles, and that said obstruction can be removed for the sum of \$80,000.

The number of vessels and tonnage entering from and clearing for foreign ports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, was 5,097, with the total tonnage of 3,816,010. There is no record of vessels in the coastwise trade, as they are not required to enter or clear, but a conservative estimate would place it as nearly double the foreign tonnage, in addition to what we term the "local fleet" of Puget Sound.

Many of the foreign and coastwise vessels would use the canal, if constructed, but its importance for protection of the local sound fleet and the lumber industry is still greater, the facts concerning which are as follows: Seven vessels of the local fleet ply between the upper sound points to Port Townsend and to points by way of Port Townsend. The number of trips made by these vessels annually in both directions were 3,848, with a total tonnage of 2,323,968. During eight months ending August 31, 1910, they carried 73,233 tons of freight for local points. The average for the year would therefore be in excess of 105,000 tons. If the canal was constructed, every one of these vessels would make use of this passage.

There is an annual towage from the Straits direct to upper sound mills of 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 feet of logs, all of which would make use of this canal. It is not an unusual sight to see six or seven tugs with tows of logs from Port Townsend Bay awaiting favorable opportunity to round Marrowstone Point. During time of storm the weather conditions off Marrowstone Point and opposite the entrance to Port Townsend Bay are as bad as can be found outside of Point Wilson, which the Government designated as open ocean.

The protection which this canal would afford to the smaller vessels of Puget Sound and to the lumber industries would, in itself, be sufficient to warrant the expenditure of the money necessary for its excavation and completion.

In the interests of the industries at the head of Port Townsend Bay, such as the Western Steel Corporation plant at Irondale, the plant of the Classon Chemical Co. at Hadlock, and the Washington Mill Co. interests at the same place, this canal is even more necessary, for the constantly increasing business at these points demand a constantly increasing traffic by water, which traffic is handicapped at present not only by bad weather conditions to be found off Marrowstone Point, but by additional distance of over 12 miles, which must be traveled in order to reach these industries.

With this canal completed, traffic between Seattle and other points on Puget Sound and the various points on Port Townsend Bay would be augmented, in that it would be open to smaller vessels than those which are now required, owing to the necessity of passing at times through exceedingly rough and dangerous weather off Marrowstone Point.

We, your petitioners, would therefore respectfully request that an appropriation of said sum of \$80,000 be made for the purposes herein stated, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 28, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 4, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES. I present a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled (twelfth regular session), respectfully petition:

That the bill now before Congress providing that appeal may be taken from the decisions rendered by the Secretary of the Interior to the Circuit Court of the United States in and for the District of Columbia be modified, in that appeals from the decisions of the Secretary of the Interior be taken to the circuit court of the United States for the district in which the land under controversy is situated, and that the bill when so amended be enacted into law.

Passed the senate February 9, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 4, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 27.

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission after four years investigation and the expenditure of \$1,000,000 has made a 40-volume report to Congress; and

Whereas it is being proposed that the immigration evils from which the Northeastern States are suffering be relieved by diverting and distributing the aliens now crowding into and congesting the slums, sweatshops, and city centers of the Northeast; and

Whereas the Immigration Commission clearly points out that this is the only country with any considerable net foreign immigration, our laws and administrative policy are the weakest of any new country, and that "substantial restriction is demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations," and the illiteracy test is recommended "as the most feasible single method for excluding undesirable immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State Senate of Tennessee (the House concurring), That we hereby memorialize Congress to immediately enact some such illiteracy test as is recommended by the Immigration Commission as is law in Australia, New Zealand, and other new countries, pass other needed immigration legislation along the lines of the Immigration Commission's suggestions, and do not pass any legislation looking to the diversion and distribution of the kind of alien population that is now congesting the northeastern cities and causing so many evils there; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate at once to the President of the United States, to our two United States Senators, and each of our Representatives at Washington, D. C., with the request that it be presented to Congress and properly referred.

Adopted February 7, 1911.

N. BAXTER, Jr.,
Speaker of the Senate.

A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 9, 1911.

BEN W. HOOPER, Governor.

I, W. D. Scruggs, chief clerk of the senate, hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 27, adopted February 7, 1911.

W. D. SCRUGGS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR presented a petition of Local Branch Sons of the Revolution, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a compilation for publication of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens and business firms of Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the dealing in cotton futures, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented memorials of Cascade Grange, No. 92, of Oakland; Aroostook County Pomona Grange, No. 7; Local Grange No. 165, of Perham; Highland Grange, No. 364, of North Penobscot; Schoodic Grange, No. 420, of Franklin; and of Silver Lake Grange, No. 327, of Weeks Mills, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gardiner, Me., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented memorials of Rocktown Grange, No. 8, of Burlington; Millstone Valley Grange, No. 169; Rancocas Grange, No. 345; Mullica Hill Grange, No. 51; and Somerset Grange, No. 7, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale and transportation of foods in cold storage, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 169, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of the Emerald Club, of Elizabeth; of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Elizabeth; of Robert Fischer, of Paterson; and of M. A. McMahon, of Paterson, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Maxey Applegate, of Freehold, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Claremont Presbyterian Church, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of race-gambling bets, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., and a petition of sundry citizens of Salem and Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Johnsonburg Grange, No. 189; Monmouth Grange, No. 92; Cedarville Grange, No. 34; Burlington Grange, No. 150; Lincoln Grange, No. 136, Westwood; Towaco Grange, No. 194; Moravian Grange, Hope; Hamilton Grange, No. 79, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of sundry citizens of Jersey City, Ridgewood, Murray Hill, Paterson, Hoboken, Cranford, and Weehawken, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church, of Newark; of Mountain View Council, of Wayne; of Anthony Wayne Council, of Newark; of Friendship Council, No. 81, of New Market, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics; of Washington Camp, No. 79, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Frenchtown; and of sundry citizens of Metuchen, North Long Branch, and Plainville, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of Lieut. Col. George L. Forman and officers of the Second New Jersey Infantry, National Guard, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pay to certain officers of the National Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the establishment of an inebriate hospital in the District, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tilton, Errol, Mason, Milan, West Concord, Weare, Boscawen, Norwalk, Atkinson, and Canaan, and of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of New London, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of J. E. Baer, O. A. Harris, Jacob W. Metzger, Harmon S. Mosher, John W. Mashner, O. B. Creager, L. C. Mosher, and J. E. Burd, of Columbia City, Ind.; of the Indianapolis Brush & Broom Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, Ind.; and of Local Grange No. 2142, Patrons of Husbandry, of Seymour, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. YOUNG presented a petition of the Montgomery County Medical Society, of Red Oak, Iowa, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented memorials of the Troy Agricultural Club, of Eagle Grove; of White Prairie Grange, No. 2039, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wilton Junction; and of sundry citizens of Nemaha and Corwith, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of H. & T. McCluskey & Sons, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 250 citizens of Stamford, Greenwich, Norwalk, South Norwalk, and Darien, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented petitions of Good Will Grange, of Glastonbury; Local Grange of Columbia; Local Grange of Suffield; Waugumbaug Grange, of South Coventry; and Local Grange of

Somers, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of sundry members of the Grand Army of the Republic, Headquarters Department of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a proposed increase in the Army and Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WARREN. I have numerous telegrams in the nature of petitions from State associations, county associations, and business associations with reference to a proposed change in tariff schedule K. They are in the nature of requests that a postponement may be had of the consideration of that subject until the Tariff Board has been heard from, with a full report on that industry. It is understood that the Tariff Board is now engaged in investigating woolgrowing and wool manufacturing, have been so engaged for some months, and will be so engaged for some little time to come.

As I do not wish unduly to encumber the RECORD I ask that one from a State association, a very short one, and one from a county association may be printed in the RECORD, and the others simply noted in the RECORD as such petitions are usually noted.

There being no objection, the petitions indicated by Mr. WARREN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., April 10, 1911

Hon FRANCIS E. WARREN,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

On behalf of the woolgrowers of Wyoming I vigorously protest against any change being made in schedule K until the National Tariff Commission reports in full. Reciprocal and tariff agitation has caused an irreparable injury to all industries of the West and we demand that our interest be not further unjustly assailed.

J. A. DEFELDER,
President Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., April 10, 1911.

Senator F. E. WARREN,

Washington, D. C.

Forty members of our association trust that you be given renewed strength and vigor to combat successfully any attempt to reduce the tariff on wool. The results of previous experience with tariff reduction even one cent lower than it is now has proved on trial to be insufficient to preserve the sheep industry, and that when the growing of wool cost at least one-fourth less than it does now. We pray that justice may prevail that we may live.

SWEETWATER COUNTY WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of Lewis Barker, Wyoming sheep commissioner, central district; Hon. F. S. King, sheep commissioner, northern district; J. J. Bentley, sheep commissioner, northern district; J. S. Atherly, secretary-treasurer, board of sheep commissioners; Boyer Bros., of Wamsutter; John Piggett, of Lander; Robert Pollock, C. H. Jenkins, George Hartman, Spalding & Soule, Chris Lkine, Joe Lane, James McGibbon Sons, A. W. Augspurger, A. R. Peters, Flake Hall, Ashley Hall, William Spell, W. W. Bowers, J. D. Naffyger, Albany County Sheep & Wool Growers' Association, Elmer Lapash, Ward Ash, Barin Land Cattle Co., Jane Stoddart, W. W. Owen, Frank Prager, Alex Bowle, E. J. Bell, Davis & Thomas, Otto Gramm, A. L. Hall, Charles Hull, James Atkinson, sr., William Atkinson, James Atkinson, jr., Theo V. Tregoning, Bert Hess, John Innes, F. L. King Bros. Co., Swan Land Cattle Co., Laramie Development Co., Running Water Ranch Co., Toltec Livestock Co., Riverside Land Stock Co., Milbrook Land & Live Stock Co., H. U. Small, and Oscar Sodegreen, of Laramie, all in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against any change being made in Schedule K of the present tariff law until the Tariff Board makes its report and the report is duly considered, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a petition of the State Association of Creamery Owners and Managers, of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale and transportation of foods in cold storage, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Glen Flora, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hiles, Wis., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of George D. Eggleston Post, No. 133, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, of Appleton, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kaukaune, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of the farmers' clubs of Sand Beach; Odessa; Berrien Center; Adrian; Harbor Beach; Ferry; Mount Pleasant; Ionia; White Pigeon; York Township, Washtenaw County; Victor Township, Clinton County; Grant; Holloway; Goodland Township, Lapeer County; Dowagiac; and Plainwell; and of Kates Bay Grange, No. 1367; Cavanaugh Lake Grange, No. 998; Lincoln Grange; Branch County Pomona Grange, No. 22; Batavia Grange, No. 95; Greenwood Grange, No. 1217; Chippewa County Grange, No. 66; Mason Grange, No. 265; Studley Grange, No. 1174; Leelanau Grange, No. 1556; Gilead Grange, No. 400; Sitka Grange, No. 861; Brady Grange, No. 61; and Liberty Grange, of the Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LORIMER presented memorials of Pomona Grange, No. 35, of Peoria County; of Charter Oak Grange, No. 1685, of Peoria; and of Alta Grange, No. 1350, of Alta, all of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of the Trades and Labor Assembly, of Quincy, and sundry citizens of McLean County, and Dunlap, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Balaton, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CRANE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Fair Haven, Vt., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Bellows Falls, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. GAMBLE. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] to the joint resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It provides for the appointment of a special joint committee, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President from Members of the Sixty-second Congress, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker from the Members of the Sixty-second Congress, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the Statutory Revision Commission, heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress, on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission; and that the joint committee be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expenses as may be deemed necessary, all such expense to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL LABORER IN THE STATIONERY ROOM.

Mr. GAMBLE. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the following resolution (S. Res. 8) submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] on the 6th instant:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ an additional laborer in the Senate stationery

room at the rate of \$720 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for—

to report it favorably, and I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A bill (S. 746) providing for the payment of certain land claims; to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

A bill (S. 747) to locate, map, and mark field of battle fought near Nashville, Tenn., December 15 and 16, 1864, to construct driveways, etc., and make an appropriation for same;

A bill (S. 748) granting an honorable discharge and back pay to William C. Chandler;

A bill (S. 749) to correct the military record of Thomas Y. Patton;

A bill (S. 750) to remove the charge of desertion resting against Benjamin H. Frisbie and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (S. 751) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William M. Cox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stone River; and

A bill (S. 753) establishing the Franklin National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 754) for the relief of M. E. Hall and the estate of James B. Hall, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 755) granting a pension to John W. Sturm;

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Ollie M. Croghan;

A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Yates;

A bill (S. 758) granting an increase of pension to James A. Russell;

A bill (S. 759) granting an increase of pension to John T. Phillips;

A bill (S. 760) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore;

A bill (S. 761) granting a pension to Mary McCloud;

A bill (S. 762) granting a pension to Joseph Owen Dennison;

A bill (S. 763) granting a pension to Robert E. Taber;

A bill (S. 764) granting a pension to George W. Johnson;

A bill (S. 765) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Norman;

A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Laws;

A bill (S. 767) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Webster;

A bill (S. 768) granting a pension to Tide Owens;

A bill (S. 769) granting a pension to Martha A. Connor;

A bill (S. 770) granting a pension to Elihu Messer;

A bill (S. 771) granting an increase of pension to Lottie J. Lewis;

A bill (S. 772) granting a pension to Georgia B. Snapp;

A bill (S. 773) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett;

A bill (S. 774) granting a pension to Eliza Houston;

A bill (S. 775) granting a pension to William A. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 776) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore;

A bill (S. 777) granting a pension to Thomas McCavan;

A bill (S. 778) granting a pension to Christopher H. Dippre;

A bill (S. 779) granting a pension to David C. Bowman;

A bill (S. 780) increasing the rate of pension to all soldiers and sailors of the War with Mexico and the widows of such soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 781) granting an increase of pension to John N. Cooter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to Michael Grace (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 783) granting a pension to John A. Estep (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 784) to appropriate a portion of the proceeds arising from the sale of public lands in Oklahoma for the construction of public highways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Elias Cleveland; and

A bill (S. 786) granting an increase of pension to Joel Goodrick (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 787) granting a pension to Lucinda Skidmore;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Reed;

A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Vincent;

A bill (S. 790) granting an increase of pension to W. B. Taylor;

A bill (S. 791) granting an increase of pension to Anary Toothman;

A bill (S. 792) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Spencer;

A bill (S. 793) granting an increase of pension to Eunice M. Lemley;

A bill (S. 794) granting a pension to Leslie Harding;

A bill (S. 795) granting a pension to Ebb Workman;

A bill (S. 796) granting an increase of pension to William J. Davis;

A bill (S. 797) granting an increase of pension to David Cain;

A bill (S. 798) granting an increase of pension to Amos Hoy;

A bill (S. 799) granting a pension to Rebecca Strouther;

A bill (S. 800) granting an increase of pension to John Boler;

A bill (S. 801) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Chadock;

A bill (S. 802) granting an increase of pension to Alexander W. Barnes;

A bill (S. 803) granting a pension to Andrew P. Crumley;

A bill (S. 804) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Whiteman;

A bill (S. 805) granting an increase of pension to Andy Phillips;

A bill (S. 806) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Staton;

A bill (S. 807) granting an increase of pension to James McConnell;

A bill (S. 808) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Shaban;

A bill (S. 809) granting a pension to George W. Johnson;

A bill (S. 810) granting an increase of pension to Bernard F. Morrow;

A bill (S. 811) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; and

A bill (S. 812) granting an increase of pension to John R. Tolbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 813) to correct the military record of David N. Kinkaid; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 814) granting a pension to Georgie A. Fifield (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 815) granting a pension to Thomas Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 816) to provide for plans and specifications for two high schools in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 817) appropriating \$25,000 for the repair of the wooden warship *Portsmouth*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 818) granting an increase of pension to Barlow A. McCoy;

A bill (S. 819) granting an increase of pension to William Baber; and

A bill (S. 820) granting an increase of pension to Chastina E. Hawley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 821) for the relief of Simon Bollinger; and

A bill (S. 822) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to Frances Doherty;

A bill (S. 824) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Thatcher; and

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Trusty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 826) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry; and

A bill (S. 827) for the relief of Isaac L. Reese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 828) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hunt;

A bill (S. 829) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Baker;

A bill (S. 830) granting an increase of pension to Seward Newton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to Hardy H. La Due (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 832) granting an increase of pension to Adelbert E. Bliss (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 833) for the relief of the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 834) for the relief of the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle and their legal representatives;

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of Joel J. Parker; and

A bill (S. 837) to reimburse the officers and crew of the light-house tender *Manzanita* for personal-property losses sustained by them on the foundering of that tender October 6, 1905; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 838) to correct the military record of David R. B. Winniford; and

A bill (S. 839) for the relief of Andrew Jackson Rand (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 840) granting a pension to Philip C. Elbert (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 841) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; and

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to Le Claire H. Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 843) for the relief of the heirs of Marianne Sainte Ana Schrepper; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 844) to extend the free transmission through the mails of official mail matter of the Organized Militia of the several States;

A bill (S. 845) to increase the efficiency of the Army and the Organized Militia of the United States; and

A bill (S. 846) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William M. Carroll (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 847) concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and common carriers while engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations, and prescribing the duties of such common carriers in reference thereto while so engaged, defining certain offenses and fixing the punishment therefor, and repealing all conflicting laws; and

A bill (S. 848) to promote the safety of travelers by limiting to 14-hour shifts the service of interstate employees in train service on interstate railroads and to provide for stated periods of permitted rest for such employees; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 849) to amend section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 850) to amend an act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a pontoon railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 851) to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of D. M. Rowland; and

A bill (S. 853) for the relief of the estate of Silas F. Baker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 854) to require the National Monetary Commission to make final report on or before December 4, 1911, and to repeal sections 17, 18, and 19 of the act entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," approved May 30, 1908, the repeal to take effect December 5, 1911; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 855) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole War,' approved July 27, 1892";

A bill (S. 856) granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in Confederate prisons;

A bill (S. 857) granting an increase of pension to James Y. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 858) granting an increase of pension to William E. Brown;

A bill (S. 859) granting an increase of pension to William Rider;

A bill (S. 860) granting an increase of pension to Elias Palmer;

A bill (S. 861) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Bal-four;

A bill (S. 862) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Williams;

A bill (S. 863) granting an increase of pension to Miller C. Hunter;

A bill (S. 864) granting an increase of pension to James H. Firman;

A bill (S. 865) granting an increase of pension to John C. Martin;

A bill (S. 866) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Coffman;

A bill (S. 867) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Graft;

A bill (S. 868) granting an increase of pension to Joel Ames (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 869) granting a pension to Archie S. Blackmer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 870) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Cray (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 871) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Nicol (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 872) granting an increase of pension to L. W. Brattain (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 873) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Coons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 874) providing for the allotment of lands to certain members of the Ponca Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 875) for the relief of the Mission Farm Co., Peter Volondra, and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 876) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bellefourche, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 877) granting an increase of pension to Archie E. Booth;

A bill (S. 878) granting an increase of pension to William Deary;

A bill (S. 879) granting a pension to Elizabeth Epke;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Read;

A bill (S. 881) granting a pension to Fred M. Weeks;

A bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Catherine M. Rogers;

A bill (S. 883) granting an increase of pension to Francis Caux (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 884) granting an increase of pension to Harvey L. Rose (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 885) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Larkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 886) granting an increase of pension to Rodney O. Hazen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 887) granting an increase of pension to George K. Smith (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 888) granting an increase of pension to Dorethey Wasall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 889) providing for the manner of making payment for water rights under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 890) to create a board to correct military records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 892) granting an increase of pension to George W. Simmons; and

A bill (S. 893) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 894) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claims of Kentucky drafted men; and

A bill (S. 895) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Louisa, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 896) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to officers and enlisted men of State military organizations who rendered military service to the Union during the War of the Rebellion, and to their widows, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 897) for the relief of Alfred L. Dutton (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER:

A bill (S. 898) for the relief of James W. Kingon; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 899) to correct the military record of John H. Fesenmeyer;

A bill (S. 900) to amend the military record of Carlos Baker;

A bill (S. 901) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Whitten;

A bill (S. 902) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Lorenzo F. Brown;

A bill (S. 903) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Reichel; and

A bill (S. 904) to amend the military record of Andrew W. Sears; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 905) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 906) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 907) granting an increase of pension to John Meelan;

A bill (S. 908) granting an increase of pension to Alburtus H. Walker;

A bill (S. 909) granting an increase of pension to Philo S. Bartow;

A bill (S. 910) granting an increase of pension to Mary Francis;

A bill (S. 911) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Neff;

A bill (S. 912) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Crawford;

A bill (S. 913) granting an increase of pension to Louis Putoz;

A bill (S. 914) granting an increase of pension to Henry Worthington;

A bill (S. 915) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hoxie;

A bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Jerome A. Shirley;

A bill (S. 917) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Chappell;

A bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Johnson;

A bill (S. 919) granting an increase of pension to William F. Jones;

A bill (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bogue;

A bill (S. 921) granting an increase of pension to Henry Frink;

A bill (S. 922) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Payne;

A bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Jane De Graw;

A bill (S. 924) granting an increase of pension to Virginia H. Morgan;

A bill (S. 925) granting an increase of pension to James Tucker;

A bill (S. 926) granting an increase of pension to Ransford P. Williams;

A bill (S. 927) granting an increase of pension to Julia Adams;

A bill (S. 928) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Sheffield;

A bill (S. 929) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. Payne; and

A bill (S. 930) granting an increase of pension to James N. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG:

A bill (S. 931) granting an increase of pension to James E. Houghland; and

A bill (S. 932) granting an increase of pension to Elias G. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 933) for the relief of Charles Christian Melchert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 934) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ouderkerk;

A bill (S. 935) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Curtis; and

A bill (S. 936) granting a pension to Sarah A. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 937) to regulate the rank of staff officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 938) for the relief of James Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 939) granting a pension to Adele A. C. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 940) granting to the city of Los Angeles certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands and national forests in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRISTOL:

A bill (S. 941) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reynolds (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 942) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 943) to improve navigation on Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 944) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 945) granting an increase of pension to Allen Turner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 946) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Keller;

A bill (S. 947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Page (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 948) granting an increase of pension to John M. Perry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 949) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dolan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 950) granting an increase of pension to Abram Ellis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to William Leftrich (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 952) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 953) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher S. Dewey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 954) to provide for the acquisition of a site on which to erect a public building at Gilmer, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 955) to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 956) to require statements of facts and to provide for exceptions to rulings of courts in deportation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 957) relating to bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 958) to amend the public-printing law; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 959) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the eastern district of North Carolina at Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 960) for the relief of Peter F. Pescud, jr., John S. Pescud, Sue B. Craig, and Mollie L. Pescud, heirs at law of Peter F. Pescud, deceased;

A bill (S. 961) for the relief of the heirs at law of E. L. Shuford, deceased;

A bill (S. 962) for the relief of the State of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 963) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 964) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 965) for the relief of the Catholic Church in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 966) for the relief of the Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Beaufort, N. C.;

A bill (S. 967) for the relief of Grace Protestant Episcopal Church, of Plymouth, N. C.;

A bill (S. 968) for the relief of Salem Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Wayne County, N. C.;

A bill (S. 969) for the relief of Beulah Primitive Baptist Church, of Johnston County, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 970) for the relief of Spencer Etheredge, J. E. Berry, and Charles Meekins, trustees of Roanoke Island Baptist Church, of Roanoke Island, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 971) granting a pension to Wiley S. Roberts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 972) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

(By request.) A bill (S. 973) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to the Hot Springs Reservation in Arkansas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 974) to correct the military record of Alonza Rich; and

A bill (S. 975) to remove the charge of desertion against Elias Gibbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 976) for the relief of the estate of Allen J. Mann, deceased;

A bill (S. 977) for the relief of the heir of Allen J. Mann, sr., deceased;

A bill (S. 978) for the relief of the heirs of Lisander Johnson, deceased;

A bill (S. 979) for the relief of Elizabeth McLaughlin, heir to William Hurley;

A bill (S. 980) for the relief of the heirs of Calep H. Stevens; and

A bill (S. 981) for the relief of the heirs of W. T. Hundley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 982) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dillingham;

A bill (S. 983) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. Chisam;

A bill (S. 984) granting a pension to Esau Walker;

A bill (S. 985) granting an increase of pension to William McClain;

A bill (S. 986) granting a pension to M. V. B. Chapman;

A bill (S. 987) granting a pension to Joseph D. Smith;

A bill (S. 988) granting a pension to Charles D. Belden;

A bill (S. 989) granting a pension to George M. Griffith;

A bill (S. 990) granting a pension to Aubrey P. Lawrence; and

A bill (S. 991) granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 992) granting a pension to Francella L. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Brooks;

A bill (S. 994) granting an increase of pension to William G. Downs;

A bill (S. 995) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Smith; and

A bill (S. 996) granting an increase of pension to Amos Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 997) for the relief of lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River in West Virginia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 998) for the relief of Henry G. Roetzel and Paul Chipman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 999) granting an increase of pension to Louise Schenkel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1000) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Shoemaker, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1001) to correct the military record of Andrew Floyd and grant him an honorable discharge (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Pierce O'Connell;

A bill (S. 1003) granting a pension to Evelina Sprague;

A bill (S. 1004) granting a pension to Osmond Ames (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1005) granting an increase of pension to Laura Adam (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1006) granting an increase of pension to Denis McCloskey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1007) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bates (with accompanying papers); and
 A bill (S. 1008) granting an increase of pension to John F. Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Greene;

A bill (S. 1010) granting an increase of pension to Kate Miller;

A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to Angella L. Shaw;

A bill (S. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Engberg; and

A bill (S. 1013) granting an increase of pension to John McConnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 1014) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Sargent;

A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Barnard;

A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Sarah A. Perkins;

A bill (S. 1018) granting a pension to Anna L. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1019) granting an increase of pension to John Hodge;

A bill (S. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Mary White;

A bill (S. 1021) granting a pension to Mrs. John Brown;

A bill (S. 1022) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Hitt;

A bill (S. 1023) granting an increase of pension to Arthur J. Powell (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1024) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jenness (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Gunther (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1026) granting a pension to Mary E. Seeley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 1027) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Marsh, alias Joseph Wright;

A bill (S. 1028) granting an increase of pension to Edson H. Webster;

A bill (S. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Avery;

A bill (S. 1030) granting an increase of pension to Sidney F. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson;

A bill (S. 1032) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Covell, jr.;

A bill (S. 1033) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Young;

A bill (S. 1034) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy; and

A bill (S. 1035) granting an increase of pension to John W. Currier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER:

A bill (S. 1036) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1037) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act providing for an inspection of meats for exportation, prohibiting the importation of adulterated articles of food or drink, and authorizing the President to make proclamation in certain cases, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1038) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon P. Sandridge (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Samuel R. Moon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1040) for the relief of Jason J. Jones (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1041) to correct the military record of James Tully;

A bill (S. 1042) to correct the military record of Samuel R. Moon;

A bill (S. 1043) to correct the military record of James Anderson (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1044) to correct the military record of Franklin Bannon; and

A bill (S. 1045) to correct the military record of Christopher L. Smith (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1046) granting an increase of pension to William C. Cook (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to John W. Teel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1048) granting an increase of pension to George F. Pond (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1049) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hunt;

A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to Francis M. Hill;

A bill (S. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Hubbard D. Carr;

A bill (S. 1052) granting an increase of pension to William A. Chapman;

A bill (S. 1053) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1054) granting an increase of pension to W. F. Hoffman; and

A bill (S. 1055) granting an increase of pension to George W. Whaley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the appointment of a commission to adjust and settle certain claims between the United States and the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUE OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I ask may be read, and before any disposition is made of it, by reference or otherwise, I desire, with the permission of the Senate, to say a word.

The bill (S. 745) providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, of the Sixty-second Congress, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson, to cost complete, not to exceed \$100,000; and, to procure plans and designs for the same, to be reported to Congress during its next session, the sum of \$5,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate I desire to make a short statement in regard to this matter.

In the Fifty-eighth Congress, in pursuance of an amendment offered by myself, the sundry civil appropriation act contained the following provision:

To enable a commission, which is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to select a site on the public grounds, in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson, to cost complete not to exceed \$100,000, and to procure plans and designs for the same to be reported to Congress during its next session, \$5,000.

The Senate will perceive that the bill which I have introduced this morning is in those identical words, with simply the substitution of the Sixty-second Congress instead of the Fifty-eighth Congress.

The sundry civil appropriation bill of that year was passed with that provision in it, and it passed the House, and was approved by the President and became a law. The subsequent illness of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, and his death a short time thereafter, caused a delay in the execution of that order of Congress, which fact was communicated to Congress in a letter by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Root, now a Member of this body. I will read the letter of the then Secretary of State, addressed to the Vice President, Charles W. Fairbanks:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1906.

SIR: I have been instructed by the commission created by the sundry civil appropriation act, approved April 23, 1904, "to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson, to cost complete, not to exceed \$100,000, and to procure plans and designs for the same, to be reported to Congress during its next session," to report to the Senate that action under the statute has been delayed by the illness and death of the late Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, but that the commission has secured the consent of Mr. Augustus St. Gaudens to make the designs for the proposed statue, which will be prepared as soon as Mr. St. Gaudens's health and previous engagements permit. The designs will be transmitted to Congress without any avoidable delay thereafter.

A similar report has been made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIHU ROOT, Chairman.

Hon. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
President of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, the ill health of the artist, St. Gaudens, which is spoken of in this communication by the then Secretary of State, continued, and he died without ever having completed his work. For that reason the order of Congress, as embodied in that statute, was not carried out.

When at a subsequent time it was thought to again revive the activities of the commission, with a view to the completion of the work, it was ascertained that under a general provision of law, by reason of the lapse of time, the appropriation had lapsed and was no longer available.

In view of that fact, at the last session of Congress I offered an amendment in the Senate to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill, which I have before me, reviving that appropriation. It is as follows:

To carry out and make effective the provision made in the act of April 28, 1904, making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government: To enable a commission, which is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson to cost complete not to exceed \$100,000, and to procure plans and designs for the same to be reported to the next Congress, \$5,000.

That amendment was referred to the Committee on the Library, by that committee reported back favorably to the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations; it was favorably reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and was passed by the Senate at the last session as an amendment to the deficiency bill; and was in the conference afterwards taken out of the bill. That is the present status.

The bill which I have introduced, in view of the fact that we will have no appropriation bills at the present session, is an independent bill, using the same language and making the same provision and the same appropriation as has already thus twice passed this body. I will repeat, it has been before the Appropriations Committee twice. It has passed the Senate twice. It has passed the House once. It has received the approval of the President in the past.

Mr. CULLOM rose.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will let me continue before I submit to an interruption.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that this is one man, while his fame is in no manner dependent upon it, to whose memory the Government should erect a statue in this Capital. He was the first President ever inaugurated in Washington. That, however, is a comparatively minor matter. He was the great apostle of a distinct body of governmental science and, in a measure, its author. As such he was the founder of a great political party which has continued without interruption for more than a hundred years. Aside from his great services in other regards during a long and memorable career, his name is indissolubly linked with two of the most important events in the history of the United States. The late Senator Hoar, whom it is always a pleasure for me to quote, once in the Senate said that Thomas Jefferson would forever pass through the halls and corridors of history with the Declaration of Independence in one hand and with the title deeds to the great Louisiana Purchase in the other.

Mr. President, this day is the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the birth of this great and illustrious man, and in view of that fact and the further fact that it has already been considered by committees and has twice passed this body, I ask that there may be unanimous consent that the bill be now passed to its third reading, and that action may be immediately had upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the request, but I will call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that in all similar bills providing for the erection of statues on the public grounds, we have excluded the grounds of the Capitol and of the Library of Congress. I ask the Senator if he has any objection to having those words inserted?

Mr. BACON. None whatever; though they were not in the previous enactments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will move an amendment, inserting the words "excluding the Capitol Grounds and the grounds of the Library of Congress." I think it would be a misfortune to invade those grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not yet before the Senate for the consideration of amendments. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what is the status of the bill now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has just been introduced, and unanimous consent is asked for its present consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Has it not been referred to a committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has introduced the bill and has asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. BACON. I want to say, with the permission of the Senator, as I do not know that he heard me, that this bill has already been considered—

Mr. LODGE. I have listened attentively to every word the Senator has said.

Mr. BACON. Very well; then I will not repeat.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to say, Mr. President, that I entirely approve of the erection of a statue to Jefferson; there ought to have been one erected long ago; but I am also extremely anxious that there should be, and there ought to be, erected in this Capital a statue to another great American statesman who has never had a statue erected to his memory here, and that is Alexander Hamilton. He represented different views on the Constitution than those of Mr. Jefferson, but he did very great work in the organization of the Government. I have introduced a bill for the erection in this city of a statue to Hamilton's memory, which has gone to the Committee on the Library; and it seems to me that it is only reasonable that both bills should take the same course. I have no objection, if my bill can be added to it, to having the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Massachusetts make no condition of that kind. Let unanimous consent be granted for the consideration of the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia, and then, so far as I am concerned, a similar unanimous consent may be granted in the case of the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts providing for the erection of a statue to Alexander Hamilton, but let us not impose a condition upon this unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I am not imposing any condition at all, Mr. President.

Mr. BACON. I want to echo what my friend from Texas says. I will most undoubtedly favor—

Mr. CULLOM. I wanted to say a moment ago, when I interrupted the Senator, that it seemed to me, under the circumstances, that this bill ought to pass without any delay.

Mr. BACON. It has twice passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. One moment. I do not wish to object, but I do wish to secure action on the Hamilton bill. If action is taken on this bill, I will then offer the Hamilton bill and ask a similar privilege for that, and I will make no objection to the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the amendment suggested by me a moment or two ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "District of Columbia," it is proposed to insert "exclusive of the Capitol Grounds and the grounds of the Library of Congress."

Mr. BACON. I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C., and that the joint resolution be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the joint resolution be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, *etc.*, That the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee of the Library of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the president and secretary of the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association are hereby created a commission with power to select a site upon the property belonging to the United States in the city of Washington, other than the Capitol and Library grounds, for the erection of a

statue to Alexander Hamilton, and to have charge of the erection of said statue, for which purpose \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary in addition to the funds contributed by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BACON. With the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts, I suggest an amendment, to strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred."

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 12, before the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred," so as to read:

For which purpose \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary in addition to the funds contributed by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to state, if he knows, what is the amount of the contribution made by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, referred to in the joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know the amount. The association has no large amount, though it has raised a few thousand dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon]. The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT RAPID CITY, S. DAK.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On Monday, through inadvertence, a bill got mixed up in my papers, and I introduced it. I refer to the bill (S. 263) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rapid City, in the State of South Dakota. Inasmuch as the last Congress acted upon the matter, I move that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

LANDS ALONG ANACOSTIA RIVER.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting the second report of Mr. Hugh T. Taggart, special counsel, on the ownership of lands and riparian rights along the Anacostia River, in the District of Columbia, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a document.

PRINTING FOR THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That authority is granted to print and bind, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects heretofore considered or to be considered by said committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO TARIFF BILLS.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following notice:

Notice is given that at the next session of the Senate I will offer a resolution proposing a change in the rules of the Senate as set forth in a copy of the resolution hereto attached:

Resolved, That there be added as one of the standing rules of the Senate the following, to wit:

"That no amendment to any bill passed by the House, amending or changing by general application the import duties prescribed by existing law, shall be in order or allowed in the Senate unless such proposed amendment seeks to amend or change a paragraph or item

embraced in the schedule or schedules, all or a part of which is sought to be amended or changed by the House bill, or unless such proposed amendment is directly related to the subject matter of the House bill and is germane thereto."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be received and lie on the table.

COTTON SEIZURES.

Mr. PERCY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That 250 copies of Senate Document No. 23, Forty-third Congress, second session, entitled "Report of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

ALASKA COAL-LAND CASES.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to ask that the opinion of the United States judge recently rendered in the Alaska coal-land cases, a copy of which I send to the desk, be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BAILEY. What is the document, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The opinion of the court in the Alaska coal-land cases.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the first responsible opinion of a United States court on the Alaska coal-land laws.

Mr. BAILEY. What court, Mr. President?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the opinion of Judge Hanford of United States district court for the western district of Washington in the ninth circuit.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a district court opinion and not a circuit court opinion?

Mr. HEYBURN. The judge was sitting in a criminal case.

Mr. BAILEY. Then he was sitting as a district judge?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not attach much importance to an opinion of that kind, but I am not going to offer any objection against printing it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to say to the Senator, knowing the situation intimately, that Judge Hanford is one of our oldest and concededly one of our ablest lawyers on the United States bench. He is a man of long years of experience; he has gone very thoroughly into the question of the relation of coal land to the existing law. No other opinion even approaching it in value has been rendered by any court. Judge Hanford, of course, sits in the circuit court of appeals in the ninth circuit, and his opinion, I think, would commend itself to the Senator from Texas as being worthy of publication.

Mr. BAILEY. Anyway it is worth printing, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the order to print is entered.

THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that next Thursday, after the conclusion of the morning business, I will, with the permission of the Senate, submit some remarks on the initiative and referendum. If the Senate shall not be in session at that time, then I will do so on the first day thereafter when the Senate is in session.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise, Mr. President, to say that it will be impossible to make a report designating the committees of the Senate before some time next week, and for that reason I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH JAPAN AND MEXICO.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, it is proper for me to state at the beginning of the remarks that I shall submit to the Senate upon the subject indicated in the resolution that it is not my purpose in any way to criticize the President in reference to the position that he has taken in connection with the troubles in Mexico. I am satisfied that whatever he does will not only be necessary and proper to be done, but will, in his opinion, be for the best interests of the country. I have arisen simply for the purpose of emphasizing what ought to be familiar to everyone who is acquainted with the institutions of the land, and that is that the doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine is not involved in the Mexican situation in any way whatever. A great many persons of intelligence, and a number of journals ably edited, are falling into the error of supposing that if there should be any disagreement between the United States and Mexico—which we all hope and believe there will not be—that the Monroe doctrine will form the basis of the controversy. I make the assertion that this is not true in any aspect of the case. I do not

suppose that there is any subject that has been discussed before Congress to a greater extent than the subject that is designated as "the Monroe doctrine," and I have upon a number of occasions, both in the House and in the Senate, contributed to the literature upon the question, so that I really feel that I ought not to inflict even upon an attentive and patient body any further comments or observations in connection therewith. What I will say, if it serves no other purpose, will at least relieve the public mind of a false impression that is rapidly gaining ground, that whenever there is any controversy between the United States and any other country upon the American continent, the Monroe doctrine immediately and mysteriously springs into existence and calls for our assertion and vindication of the principles that it enunciates.

One proposition I desire to make perfectly plain, and that is that we must not confuse or commingle in any degree the Monroe doctrine with the Roosevelt doctrine. During the reign of ex-President Roosevelt a lot of miscellaneous doctrines were launched upon the tide of time that were all called "The Monroe doctrine," but which, in point of fact, had no possible connection with it and were not related to it in any manner whatever.

The Roosevelt doctrine, properly defined, is the doctrine of the gentleman with the shillalah at Donnybrook Fair, "Whenever you see a head, hit it." The ex-president once upon a time composed a brief treatise upon the Monroe doctrine. This is not the work in which he referred to the men who helped to frame that governmental principle as "shifty doctrinaires, mediocre minds, and imbeciles." The treatise that I refer to is another publication, and it is extremely difficult to procure a copy of it. They seem to have all disappeared, either by the public taking them or owing to the fact that the President himself bought them all up, and thus withdrew them from public inspection. It is a treatise that the ex-President need not be ashamed of in any way, because he was writing about a subject that he knew all about, which was not always the case with reference to numerous other subjects to which he has upon a great many occasions devoted his great talents and ability. A few years ago, and long after this book was written, Mr. Roosevelt announced his new doctrine that I have referred to, and which at the time provoked the criticism of every lawyer at the American bar who was at all conversant with the principles of international law and amazed every statesman and diplomatic official in the civilized world. His doctrine was that in the event that any of the States upon the American Continent refused, either from wantonness or inability, to perform their contractual obligations, that foreign nations, protecting their citizens who were creditors, could enforce the payment of those obligations through the instrumentality of war.

When I came to the Senate this new doctrine struck me with such appalling terror that I could not resist the opportunity of endeavoring to controvert it to the best of my ability in an address delivered to this body. The inference that the ex-President drew, in a message that he sent to the Senate, was in connection with the affairs of Santo Domingo, and he boldly and unhesitatingly proclaimed that if Santo Domingo failed to pay her debts the Governments of Holland and of Belgium, representing their citizens who were creditors, might collect those debts through the process of war, and that therefore the Monroe doctrine came into immediate operation, and the imperative duty devolved upon us to seize the custom receipts of Santo Domingo and divide them among her creditors in order to prevent the capture and occupation of her territory by foreign nations. I venture to say that a more grotesque interpretation of the Monroe doctrine was never incorporated in any message that ever issued from the Executive chamber.

In pursuance of this mad policy—which if there had been a spark of life left in the bodies of Jefferson, or of Adams, or Monroe, would have made them tremble in their graves—Mr. Roosevelt proceeded to carry it into execution, and after he had taken possession of the customhouses of Santo Domingo and had collected their revenues and deposited them in a financial institution in New York, he gave the Senate the privilege of maintaining what he was pleased to call "the status quo" between the United States and Santo Domingo.

Mr. President, such a status quo never existed upon all the pages of civilized or uncivilized history. I will not do myself the credit of claiming that my remarks at that time—during the course of which I cited an unbroken line of diplomatic and international precedents against the proposition contained in the message—had any influence whatever in making the ex-President modify the message a week or so afterwards, in which he denied that he ever meant to say that the failure to pay contractual debts was a justification for war. Of course, my contention was that the right to commence hostilities against a country

never existed in a case of this sort, but was limited to cases where an unjustifiable trespass or tort was committed against persons who were citizens of the complaining Government, or where they were in some way deprived of their liberties or international rights, and the Government that had committed the crime persistently refused to make reparation therefor or was in such a condition that reparation could not be obtained at the hands of its judicial system.

Let us look for a moment at what sort of wars we would have if the Roosevelt construction of the Monroe doctrine was to prevail and was to be incorporated into our diplomatic code. We would have an interminable succession of bondholders and stock-market wars. War, instead of being declared by Congress, could be practically declared by the banking syndicates of London, Paris, Amsterdam, and Berlin, represented by their financial agents in America, and we would become sponsors and guarantors for every bankrupt and impoverished government in Central or South America. We have never yet been informed as to what amount of money was made out of the Santo Domingo settlement nor what was the price at which their bonds were sold before our intervention, and what was the price that the holders afterwards obtained for them in settlement of their claims, nor who was in the deal, nor who were the beneficiaries of our interference.

I would like to ask, in this connection, what right have any of our citizens to engage in enterprises in these countries, charge them the most exorbitant and extortionate prices for the construction of public works, and then demand of the United States that it must nominate itself as a receiver over the revenues of the government that they have practically driven into bankruptcy and liquidate its indebtedness? Where is there an intelligent person in the United States, who has studied the history and institutions of the country, who can draw the slightest parallel between this doctrine, first proclaimed by Mr. Roosevelt, and the doctrine that bears the name of Monroe, sustained by the names of Jefferson and of Madison and of Adams? The despots of Austria and of Russia and of Prussia, when they formed the Holy Alliance, whatever else may be said of them, were not mercenaries or hirelings. When they met at Aix la Chappelle and Laybach in conference they had but one object in view and that was to put an end to the system of representative government throughout the world, to destroy the liberty of the press, and to maintain the *jure divino* autocracies of Europe, and when Mr. Monroe wrote to Jefferson submitting the British proposals of Mr. Canning, and when Jefferson, on October 24, 1823, answered from Monticello:

The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a Nation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us.

Did he in his prophetic mind have the remotest conception that this great charter of republican liberty which he was helping to frame was to be used by buccaners and speculators and adventurers to oppress the commercial liberties of the very States whose personal liberties it was supposed to guarantee? I will not sit here in silence, with folded arms, and permit this revolutionary principle which was formulated and promulgated overnight by Mr. Roosevelt to be known by any other name except the name of the illustrious individual who first conceived it and put it into practical execution. I want to lift this cloud from around the brow of the rising generation. I want the students at our colleges and universities to understand that when they are discussing this proposition they are not discussing the Monroe doctrine or any corollary that flows from it in any manner whatever. They are simply discussing a doctrine that has received practical recognition at the purlieus of American brokers and speculators who deal in South and Central American securities and at the gambling dens of Amsterdam bankers and foreign stock markets, and it is a disgrace and a degradation to connect this money-making enterprise with the imperishable names that in tones that rang and reechoed throughout the world pledged forever the honor of this Republic to maintain the blessings of liberty in every quarter and section of the Western Continent where despotism had ceased to hold its sway.

We might let Mr. Roosevelt's doctrine rest where it is were it not for the fact that the ex-President has set some of the schools of this country almost deranged upon the subject. He has perverted the history of the Nation to such an extent that every day in the year, in answer to innocent communications that I receive, I am using my best efforts to relieve these young minds of the false impressions and confusion with which he has surrounded them. It is impossible for me to dictate letters to all of the attendants at all of the schools in the United States telling them not to pay any attention to this new doctrine of the ex-President, and it is principally for this reason that I have

arisen here to-day that I may say a few words that may possibly reach some of the victims whose future ambition he has imperiled by his heretic utterances upon the subject.

Let me read a few communications out of the many that I am receiving from some of these young men, for the purpose of illustrating the havoc and ruin that he has caused among the tender disciples of his school. Here is one of the letters:

Will you please tell me what stand, in your opinion, ex-President Roosevelt would take upon this Mexican question if he had a hand in it? I am in a debate upon the subject, and I would like to have any of his speeches that you can send me. I will try to work my way out of it if I can just find out how he stands and how you stand. I am so fond of reading his speeches and yours. They have the true ring in them, and they are very much alike.

Poor boy. He really thought he was paying me a compliment. I read a second communication:

Will you explain to me what connection the Monroe doctrine has with the case in Mexico? I have read Mr. Roosevelt's message on Santo Domingo, but I am mixed up about it—

No wonder.

What I would like to know is this: Suppose the Mexican people would turn their Government into a monarchy, would we have a right to interfere?

This communication came just in time, and the question was a very intelligent and pertinent one. I sent this boy an observation of Mr. Dana's in a note to Wheaton, which happened to be in direct response to his inquiry. As it is only a few lines and covers the exact point that I am discussing here to-day, I will read the extract:

It has sometimes been assumed that the Monroe doctrine contained some declarations against any other than the democratic-republican institutions of this continent, however arising or introduced. The message will be searched in vain for anything of the kind. We were the first to recognize the imperial authority of Dom Pedro in Brazil and of Iturbide in Mexico; and more than half of the northern continent was under the scepters of Great Britain and Russia; and those dependencies would certainly be free to adopt what institutions they pleased in case of successful rebellion or of peaceful separation from their parent states.

The third, and last, communication that I will read is as follows:

We have the Mexican question up for debate next week. I would like to know how does the Monroe doctrine get into it?

So would I.

Did Mr. Roosevelt pass any laws of Congress, when he was President, on the subject? I would like to have your private opinion on the following question: If Mr. Roosevelt was in charge of Mexico, what do you think he would do with the United States? I am on the affirmative.

Then there is a postscript, as follows:

Please send me Senator HENRY'S speech in which he said that the people who were in favor of electing United States Senators by the people could not spell his name, and most of them could not spell their own names. Also let me have Senator BOURNE'S speech, and kindly let me know whether Mr. Roosevelt is a member of the new party that is now being made up.

I have selected these few communications from among hundreds of similar ones to show how students who are trying to familiarize themselves with the political history of the country have had their minds perverted and prostrated upon some of the great and imperishable principles that underlie our institutions. I want now to announce to them in such unambiguous terms that they can not be misunderstood, and which will perhaps obviate the necessity of my answering a number of communications in the future, that our present movement or maneuvers in reference to Mexico have not the slightest relation to or bearing upon the Monroe doctrine. I will again give them an extract from President Monroe's message, from which the doctrine receives its name, which practically carries the entire subject with it:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintain it and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

On March 25, 1825, Mr. Clay, who was then Secretary of State, transmitted to our minister at Mexico a communication, from which I quote the following lines:

The political systems of the two continents are essentially different. Each has an exclusive right to judge for itself what is best suited to its own condition and most likely to promote its happiness, but neither has a right to enforce upon the other the establishment of its peculiar system, and you will therefore urge upon the Government of Mexico the utility and expediency of asserting this principle on every proper occasion.

On October 21, 1858, Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, sent to our minister at Spain a communication, from which I will also quote a few lines, as follows:

With respect to the causes of war between Spain and Mexico the United States have no concern and do not undertake to judge them. Nor do they claim to interpose in any hostility which may take place. Their policy of observation and interference is limited to the permanent subjugation of any portion of the territory of Mexico, or of any other American state, to any European power whatever. The American minister is authorized to say that the United States considered Mexico's freedom from foreign control to be essential to the true policy of the independent states of America, and that any attempt to subdue or hold possession of that country would be considered by the United States as an unfriendly act and would be firmly opposed by them.

We all know what occurred with Mexico a little later on; and while I do not at all depend upon our action in that controversy as a precedent for what we ought to do if a similar occasion and emergency presented itself to-day, I want to read only a few lines of an instruction sent by Mr. Cass to Mr. Robert M. McLane, who was then our minister to Mexico:

While we do not deny the right of any other power to carry on hostile operation against Mexico for the redress of its grievances, we firmly object to its holding possession of any part of that country or endeavoring by force to control its political destiny. This opposition to foreign interference is known to France, England, and Spain, as well as the determination of the United States to resist any such attempt by all the means in their power.

And I will close references upon this point by reading a resolution passed by the House of Representatives, without dissent, on April 4, 1864, as follows:

That the Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to have the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico, and they think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

Now, while volumes have been written upon the subject that I have been discussing, I have read a sufficient number of extracts to satisfy anyone who has a grain of sense or intelligence in these United States of America that whatever the Mexican situation may be, the Monroe doctrine, as such—whatever the Roosevelt doctrine may be—does not at any point come in touch or contact with it, and that there is not now the remotest danger—and there never will be, in my judgment—that any government on this earth will ever attempt to subvert the Republic of Mexico and upon her ruins erect monarchical institutions.

It is said, however, that the property of American citizens may be in jeopardy and in danger in the Republic of Mexico, and that they are entitled to the protection of the United States. In explanation of this suggestion, I would state that the Department of State, presided over by the Secretary of State, and not the Department of War, presided over by the Secretary of War, has jurisdiction and supervision over this matter. The State Department has adopted certain regulations upon this subject, and which are in the hands of our diplomatic officials, which must be strictly followed whenever a claim of a citizen of the United States for redress or indemnity may be diplomatically presented to a foreign government.

The Army of the United States is not an agency for the collection of private debts. I have no greater right, if I were a citizen of the United States living in Mexico, to call upon the Army of the United States to collect a claim either for redress or indemnity against the Government of Mexico than I would have a right to call upon the Militia of the State of Maryland to collect a sum of money that may be due me by the State upon public obligations. I am sure this is the opinion of the President. If any syndicate of mine owners, or any rubber companies, or Standard Oil interests should at any time suffer any injury to their possessions or acquisitions, they have no greater rights than the humblest individual whose property has been injured or destroyed.

And I want, in this very connection, to quote a few lines from a communication of Mr. Seward to our minister at Colombia upon this subject, sent to him in April, 1866. In this communication Mr. Seward says:

We are unfortunately too familiar with the complaints of the delay and the inefficiency of the courts in the South American Republics. We must, however, continue to repose confidence in their independence and integrity, or we must take the broad ground that these States are like those of oriental semicivilized countries—outside the pale within which the law of nations, as generally accepted by Christendom, is understood to govern. The people who go to these regions and encounter great risks in the hope of getting rewards must be regarded as taking all the circumstances into consideration, and can not with reason ask their government to complain that they stand on a common footing with native subjects in respect to the alleged wants of an able, prompt, and conscientious judiciary. We have not undertaken to supervise the arrangements of the whole world for litigation because American citizens voluntarily expose themselves to be concerned in their deficiencies.

Of course, Mr. President, I know full well that if the liberty or the personal rights of our citizens in Mexico or anywhere else are interfered with, or their property wantonly destroyed at the hands of revolutionists or other forces, and the government in which the trouble occurs is either unwilling to protect them or has not the power to do so, that we need not stand idly by, but that we have the right, and it is our duty, to resort to various methods plainly recognized by the usages of international law for the purpose of affording proper protection to the rights of our citizens.

I come now, briefly, to a subject in connection with my remarks that is of great interest to us, and that is the relation between the United States and Japan, that seems to have been brought into prominence by the Mexican situation.

I want to premise what I propose to say upon this subject by the statement that it is my own positive conviction that there is no danger, presently or remotely, of any war between Japan and the United States. The United States certainly has no idea of even preparing the way for hostilities against Japan because there is no cause for such a procedure, and Japan has no grievance against or controversy with the United States that can not be amicably settled upon the field of peace. It is true that Japan might take certain steps with Mexico that would arouse our suspicion and perhaps furnish cause for investigation. I am not an idealist or visionary in matters of this sort. But why these countries should go to war it is impossible for any one to understand outside of military circles and inflammatory journalists. What is the *casus belli*? The immigration question or the school question in San Francisco? It is too absurd to contemplate that such a proposition that can be settled by treaty and the good sense of the American people should ever become the occasion for war. It is, however, boldly proclaimed that Japan wants to control the Pacific Ocean from Capricorn to Cancer, and in time of war hold it against the world. How absolutely ludicrous is this proposition! I know the spirit of the Japanese people pretty well, and when I speak of the people of either country I am not speaking of the mob, but of the intelligence and patriotism of their representative elements.

The people of Japan constitute a marvelous and courageous race. They have lately concluded a war in which they were animated with a spirit of lofty heroism and daring valor and ambitious sacrifice hardly paralleled upon all the pages of history, and they emerged from this war victorious in every battle upon the land and on the sea. I am willing to admit that if Japan is entering into negotiations for coaling stations and bases for naval supplies for military purposes with Mexico that we are entitled to know what these negotiations are. Congress is, however, without any information or evidence upon the subject. This country would not ordinarily be entitled to know the secret treaties or alliances that other countries may make, but upon the part of Mexico we would unquestionably be entitled to an explanation.

I have no fear that history will repeat itself, or that any Government would attempt to imitate the example of Napoleon III, who through false pretenses and subterfuges sent an Austrian archduke to a Mexican throne simply to abandon him afterwards to despair and death.

It is also stated that the situation at Guam is threatening and gives evidence of an intention on the part of Japan to prepare for hostilities. Guam is one of our princely volcanic possessions in the Pacific bequeathed to us by the Spanish War. It is one of the Ladrone Islands, or "islands of thieves," thus named because when they were discovered the art of stealing from each other was the principal industry and delightful occupation of their inhabitants. Guam is about 5,000 miles west of San Francisco and about 1,342 miles from Yokohama. It was brought into captivity as a maritime prize by the American cruiser *Charleston*, which, with a single shot, leveled its formidable battlements and took possession of this volcanic eruption in the name of the United States. The old Spanish governor, who had been there from time immemorial, was under the impression that the Americans were saluting him and appeared upon the deck of the ship to tender his apologies for not having any powder with which to return the compliment. He never discovered the terrible state of affairs until the Spanish colors were lowered from the parapet and the colors of the Union floated in triumph over this priceless gem of the sea.

Guam is a charming spot, and one of the most lustrous and brilliant jewels in our oriental galaxy. Its principal products are vipers, snakes, lizards, wild swine, rats, and castor oil, and if the island were put up at auction to-day, with all of the inhabitants in it, beyond its value as a military post, it would not bring a dollar and a half in any of the markets of the world. It must not be lost sight of, however, that Guam is the key to communication upon the Pacific Ocean and the relay

point for cables to Manila, Tokio, and San Francisco. It is necessary to relay messages to Guam, because of the resistance which the submarine current encounters in its journey from Honolulu, and if Japan ever came into possession of Guam we could be cut off from communication with the Philippines, except by way of the Azores and the Suez route, and thence to the Indian Ocean.

So far as I am concerned, I would not care, if we could bring our own citizens home, whether we would be cut off to all eternity from any further communication with the Philippines. I would have permitted them to go long ago. Those of her inhabitants who are civilized, I would permit them to remain civilized; those who are uncivilized, I would permit them to remain uncivilized. Perhaps they are happier when they are uncivilized than when they are civilized. I do not believe this Government is an institution for the feeble-minded nations of the earth.

I shall not refer to the dreadful mistake we made in reference to the Philippines. All the pages of history, ancient, medieval, and modern, do not record such a stupid and stupendous blunder. It is said that Japan wanted these islands. Never on the face of the earth in the way that we wanted them. What Japan might have desired was what we ought to have been satisfied with, and that is a military base for war vessels and naval supplies and for coaling stations, and what we ought to have done was to have made the terms for such an occupation and then sailed away in triumph, satisfied with the victory we had won. Does anyone believe that Japan would have burdened herself with the government of the entire Philippine group or would have been willing to incur the outlay necessary for that purpose? Our victory has been turned into a policy of disaster and sacrifice. It is said that we can not part with them now. Why not? Could we not reserve sufficient space upon this territory to give us a landing place for this great war that is looming up upon the horizon and illuminating the waters of the Pacific and the lurid imagination of some of our great sea captains who, if this war is not hastened, may be upon the retired list before they will be afforded an opportunity of practicing their profession upon their fellow man? The only person that I know of who will perhaps object to this arrangement is the Sultan of Sulu, who is our principal subject in the Orient. It will be a national calamity for us to lose this loyal liegeman. He might some day be a Senator of the United States; in fact, I think he ought to be one now. The question is whether he would be willing to exchange his gilded manacles and his salary for liberty. It is true that we have civilized him to some extent. When he became our captive he was a very pious and devout person, who spent all day Thursday praying in the mosque and the balance of the week he devoted to piracy, murder, and other gentle and respectable amusements. He was then in possession of three kinds of wives—the first-class ones lived in his palace, the second schedule abided with their mother-in-law, and the third, indulging in a fluid decoction that forms one of the delightful beverages of that charming region, spent most of their festive and hilarious hours in jail.

Mr. President, I shall be glad when we can ring down the curtain upon this comedy and tragedy and when the whole performance shall end and this Government shall divest itself of a possession that has been a curse and affliction to us from the day that we tasted this forbidden fruit.

As it is, I suppose we must defend the Philippines as a matter of sentiment, and therefore it is of some importance to us to find out whether the Government of Japan has undertaken to lay its own cable to Guam, because if it did so it simply had no right to take this step without our consent. The law of submarine cables between foreign Governments and the United States has been well established, and I desire to read just a few lines, to show what the law is upon the subject. On May 11, 1897, there was an application by "The French Company of Telegraphic Cables" for permission to lay a cable between Brest and Cape Cod, and in answer to this request the State Department replied as follows:

It is the expectation of the Federal Government that the French cable company will take no steps toward laying its proposed cable from Cape Cod without express authorization of the President or of Congress, before which a bill was introduced which has not yet been enacted into law. If that company should, however, take action in the manner proposed, it is proper to say that it would do so at its peril.

And the Attorney General, sustaining the State Department, decided—

That the President has the power, in the absence of legislative enactment, to control the landing of foreign submarine cables. He may either prevent the landing or permit it, if the rights entrusted to his care so demand or permit it. If a landing has been effected without the consent or against the protest of this Government, respect for its

rights and compliance with its terms may be enforced by applying the prohibition to the operation of the line unless the necessary conditions are accepted and observed.

Under the usages and principles of international law Japan would clearly have no right to lay a cable to Guam or to any other possession or territory of the United States without our consent. I do not believe that Japan has been guilty of this act, because its advisers and counsellors are men who are too well informed upon the principles of international usages to permit such an intrusion and violation to occur.

I am therefore of the opinion, from what I have said, that there will be no war—no war with Japan, no war with Mexico, and no war with any other nation that I know of. Of course, agitation will create uneasiness and alarm. Before the commencement of the Spanish War the proprietor of one of the most prominent newspapers in this country received a message from his correspondent in Cuba, "There will be no war." He telegraphed back to his representative, "You furnish the news, and I will furnish the war." There was cause, however, for the Spanish War. That war had to come, and Spain had to be driven from the shores of the Western Continent.

I have observed within the last few days that the German Chancellor in the Reichstag, following his earlier utterances upon the same subject, gave expression to this sentiment in connection with the general subject of peace and war that I have been discussing to-day. He said that—

The difficulty in a disarmament agreement is the impossibility of supervision of individual States. The control over these I regard as absolutely impracticable. The mere attempt to control would have no other result than continual mutual distrust and universal turmoil. It will remain true that the weak will be the prey of the strong. If any nation feels that it is unable longer to spend certain sums for defensive purposes, it will inevitably drop to the second rank. There will always be a strong one ready to take its place. General disarmament is an unsolvable problem as long as men are men.

I would change this by saying that "general disarmament is an unsolvable problem as long as men are savages." Of course Germany is a great military power, and its history has been one of war and conflict and strife, and its people, besides their historic deeds of valor, are intellectually and morally as great a race as there is on earth, either in the arts of war or in the arts of peace, and this sentiment of the chancellor would, I apprehend, have met with universal recognition during all the centuries, from the time the Cimbri and the Teutons came out of their northern forests to ravage the fields of Italy until the time that the German hosts made their triumphant entry upon the streets of Paris. I doubt, however, whether this declaration at this hour meets with the approval of a vast number of the Emperor's subjects, and I know it does not reflect the wishes and the hopes of an advanced civilization. Of course there can not be a general disarmament if Germany declines to enter the list. I believe, however, the day is bound to come when Germany will yield if all the races of the civilized world consent to the adoption of such a policy and the action taken in the Reichstag gives promise in that direction.

I believe the time will come when war will no longer be indulged in, but will only be read of as one of the crimes of a barbarous age. Nations can be civilized in some respects and barbarians in others. History affords us numerous examples of this sort, and while we are gradually becoming more and more enlightened and advanced, we still cling to this brutal method of adjusting our differences. If an individual offers an insult to another, no matter how atrocious it may be, and the insulted party calls for a retraction, which is refused, and then declares war upon the offender and punishes him in fair and open combat, it is an offense that society condemns, and it inflicts its penalties lightly or severely, according to the degree of injury sustained; but if a nation—that is to say, a multitude of individuals—offers an indignity, no matter how slight it is, to another nation and does not make reparation therefor, the nation that is offended, according to our present code of international morals, has the right to open hostilities, and slaughter and violence upon the enemy are not only justified, but become acts that every true patriot who loves his country should take a hand in and be proud of, as a heritage to transmit to his descendants. If two individuals enter into a contract and afterwards disagree about its proper interpretation, we have appointed tribunals to settle the controversy between them, and it would be rather a novel sight to witness one of them attempting to enforce his construction of the agreement upon the other at the point of the bayonet; but if two enlightened, God-fearing governments enter into a treaty and the one should happen, according to the judgment of the other, to violate it, society has concluded that the only cure is to sacrifice human life and to keep on sacrificing it until one party or the other, through sheer exhaustion of its resources and vital energies, is compelled to admit that it has made an error in its version of the compact.

If an individual happens to appropriate property that belongs to another, we have ordained a method by which the wrong can be speedily redressed; but if a great nation, by a stroke of diplomacy or statesmanship, as it is called, steals a country thousands of miles away from its borders, that some other nation claims to have stolen years before, there is nothing except bloodshed that can determine who is the lawful thief, and in the settlement of this contention it is highly proper and commendable for both sides to massacre and exterminate the unfortunate natives whom Providence has planted there as the rightful possessors of the disputed territory.

Of course, under existing conditions it may be proper, Mr. President, in time of peace to prepare for war. A number of intelligent persons are of the impression that ex-President Roosevelt was the first one who ever gave this advice. They forget that Washington, in his address to both Houses of Congress in 1790, said:

To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

It was perfectly proper to give this advice at that time. Washington, however, was not the first one who made this suggestion. Upon the armories of Venice there is this inscription:

Happy is that State which in time of peace thinks of war.

Long before this, in the Satires of Horace, there is found the expression:

In peace a wise man should make suitable provision for war.

This barbarian motto, therefore, is not original with Mr. Roosevelt. I would like to reverse it. Instead of saying, "In time of peace prepare for war," I would say, "In time of threatened war prepare for peace."

Speaking for myself, I am for peace and not for war. I believe the time is approaching when the science of war and standing armies, and navies patrolling the waters of the world, and death-dealing projectiles, and human sacrifice, and cities ruined and fertile plains made barren by the marauder's torch will rank among the dark deeds of the past. I look for the advent of that day and feel with all my fervent hopes and aspirations that it can not be long delayed. "Man's inhumanity to man" has made the "countless thousands mourn," and broken hearts and homes made desolate and agony and anguish and despair can not forever plead in vain. This inhuman and sanguinary method of settling international controversies must cease, and murder, though clad in martial pomp, must call a halt. Nations must no longer be brutes and savages, and the worshipping world must realize that it is profaning the altars of its faith when it not only sanctions but commends and exalts and participates in the practice of a policy which, heading the whole calendar of crimes and embracing every single one of them, is "an utter mockery of religion's holiest offices and bids defiance to the providence of God."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want merely to say a word in support of the view which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] has given us in regard to the Japanese in connection with the difficulties now existing in Mexico. I have examined with some care the correspondence, which, of course, it would not be proper to make public at this time, relating to affairs in Mexico for the last few months. I have been unable to discover in any letter from our ambassador or any of our consuls the slightest allusion or suggestion of any Japanese interference or appearance in Mexico. So far as I am able to judge, all that has been published and republished on that subject in the newspaper press is a fabrication, for what object I shall not undertake to determine. Some strong force is behind it—some great interest, perhaps, or some country—but that the matter is a fabrication I have no doubt.

Our relations with Japan are very friendly. We have just concluded a treaty which has been gratifying to both countries. The attitude of Japan in regard to Mexico has been entirely correct, so far as I am aware, and I wanted to take this opportunity, in support of what the Senator from Maryland has said, simply to make this brief statement in regard to the relation of Japan to the present difficulties in Mexico.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I want to say a word in confirmation of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I also have looked into the question of the alleged interference of the Japanese Government, and, so far as I can learn, there is not a scintilla of truth in it.

RETURN OF STATE BONDS—CORRECTION OF RECORD.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I notice, Mr. President, that in the RECORD of March 4, 1911, the following appears under the heading "Return of State bonds":

Mr. FOSTER. I call up the bill (S. 7180) authorizing the Secretary of War to return to the governor of Louisiana certain bonds of the

State of Louisiana and city of New Orleans, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, that is an error, so far as the mention of my name in connection therewith is concerned. I know nothing about the bill; I did not object to it; and if objection was made it must have been made by some other Senator than myself, and the reference to me must be an error of the stenographer or clerk who made up the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Without objection, the Record will be corrected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suppose it is too late to correct the Record in that respect, as it appears to have been bound. If, however, it is possible to correct the permanent Record, I should like to have it done; or, if not, at any rate I should like this statement of mine to go into the Record, as of course it will.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I objected. So objection was made, and it is merely a question as to who made it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President, with reference to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], I wish to say that upon the day mentioned in the Record I did call up the bill and ask unanimous consent for its consideration, and objection was made. The objection, however, was not made by the Senator from Connecticut, who has just spoken, but the objection was made by his former colleague, Mr. Bulkeley.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1911.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

Roland P. Falkner, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director of the Thirteenth Decennial Census, in the Department of Commerce and Labor, vice W. F. Willoughby.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Walter L. Fisher, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Interior, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Richard A. Ballinger, resigned.

MEMBER OF CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Maj. Sherwood A. Cheney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Capt. Thomas H. Jackson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be relieved.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 6, 1911.

Edward Sinnet Bowman, of Iowa.
Marion Sunsari Lombard, of Nebraska.
Ralph Charles Matson, of Oregon.
Warren Pearl Morrill, of Maryland.
Lewis Beers Porter, of Rhode Island.
Thomas Houston Dow Griffiths, of Illinois.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 10, 1911.

Charles Spencer Williamson, of Illinois.
Maurice Rubel, of Illinois.
Albert Hurlbut Roler, of Illinois.
Frank Worthington Lynch, of Illinois.
Philip Pietersen Schuyler Doane, of Illinois.
James Alexander Harvey, of Illinois.
Junius Clarkson Hoag, of Illinois.
Jacob Frank, of Illinois.
Carey Culbertson, of Illinois.
Carl Wagner, of Illinois.
William Cuthbertson, of Illinois.
Rufus Winfield Bishop, of Illinois.
William Louis Baum, of Illinois.
Joseph Grindon, of Missouri.
William Paul Glennon, of Missouri.

Frederick Charles Esselbruegge, of Missouri.
Edward Lee Dorsett, of Missouri.
William Sidney Deutsch, of Missouri.
Russell Daniel Carman, of Missouri.
Holdsworth Wheeler Bond, of Missouri.
Charles Wyche, of Missouri.
Frederick Eno Woodruff, of Missouri.
William Otto Winter, of Missouri.
Carroll Smith, of Missouri.
Nathaniel Meacon Semple, of Missouri.
Henry Joseph Scherck, of Missouri.
Francis Le Sirelle Reder, of Missouri.
Amand Nicholas Ravold, of Missouri.
Harry Morgan Moore, of Missouri.
George Elmer Lyon, of Missouri.
William Henry Luedde, of Missouri.
Clarence Loeb, of Missouri.
Abram Chittenden Leggat, of Missouri.
Frederick Carl Emil Kuhlmann, of Missouri.
Arthur Campbell Kimball, of Missouri.
Walter Charles George Kirchner, of Missouri.
Downey Lamar Harris, of Missouri.
William Augustus Hardaway, of Missouri.
Henry Skillman Atkins, of Missouri.
Frederick Bagby Hall, of Missouri.
Conrad Weil, of California.
Alanson Weeks, of California.
Stanley Stillman, of California.
William Parsons Read, of California.
William Evelyn Hopkins, of California.
Samuel Johns Hunkin, of California.
George Herbert Evans, of California.
James Alexander Black, of California.
John Henry Barbat, of California.
Charles Andrew Powers, of Colorado.
Henry Richardson McGraw, of Colorado.
Clarence Bancroft Ingraham, jr., of Colorado.
Thomas Edward Carmody, of Colorado.
Alpha John Campbell, of Colorado.
Frederic Wolcott Bancroft, of Colorado.
John William Ames, of Colorado.
John Edgar Welch, of New York.
Prince Albert Morrow, of New York.
James Ewing, of New York.
John Augustus Hartwell, of New York.
Julius Carl Bierwirth, of New York.
Edward Quintard, of New York.
George Norton Miller, of New York.
Max Ballin, of Michigan.
Guy Leartus Connor, of Michigan.
Arthur David Holmes, of Michigan.
Louis Jacob Hirschman, of Michigan.
William Edward Keane, of Michigan.
George Edwin McKean, of Michigan.
William Albert Spitzley, of Michigan.
Henry Rockwell Varney, of Michigan.
John Walter Vaughan, of Michigan.
William Stevenson Baer, of Maryland.
Julius Friedenwald, of Maryland.
Cary Breckinridge Gamble, jr., of Maryland.
Duncan MacCalman, of Maryland.
Rupert Norton, of Maryland.
Isaac Rosenbaum Pels, of Maryland.
Arthur Marriott Shipley, of Maryland.
Martillus Louis Todd, of Maryland.
Walter Dent Wise, of Maryland.
Randolph Winslow, of Maryland.
Hubert Clement Knapp, of Maryland.
Frank Martin, of Maryland.
Charles Edmund Simon, of Maryland.
Louis Hamman, of Maryland.
Marshall Langton Price, of Maryland.
John Almy Tompkins, jr., of Maryland.
Joseph Albert Chatard, of Maryland.
Thomas Rodney Chambers, of Maryland.
Charles French Blake, of Maryland.
Harvey Grant Beck, of Maryland.
Standish McCleary, of Maryland.
Charles Woodward Riley, of Maryland.
Alexius McGlannan, of Maryland.
Edgar Bar Friedenwald, of Maryland.
Charles Alfred Dukes, of California.
Arnold Schwyzer, of Minnesota.
Anton Shlimonek, of Minnesota.
Edward Avery Newton, of Oregon.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Hugh Rodman to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Guy W. Brown to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1910, to fill vacancies:

George E. Brandt,
Cary W. Magruder,
Joseph S. Hulings,
James G. Stevens,
William A. Hodgman, and
Carleton M. Dolan.

Lieut. Charles E. Courtney, an additional number in grade, to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next above him.

Lieut. Edward C. Kalbfus to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Capt. Randolph C. Berkeley to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of October, 1910, to fill a vacancy.

AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Elton A. Gongwer, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the War Department, in place of Benjamin F. Harper, resigned.

ASSAYER AND MELTER UNITED STATES ASSAY OFFICE, CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Frank P. Drane, of North Carolina, to be assayer and melter of the United States assay office at Charlotte, N. C., under the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1911.

AMBASSADORS.

William Woodville Rockhill, of the District of Columbia, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey, vice Oscar S. Straus, resigned.

Curtis Guild, of Massachusetts, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Russia, vice William Woodville Rockhill, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Bertram N. Stump, of Maryland, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Baltimore, Md., in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

PENSION AGENT.

Abram W. Smith, of McPherson, Kans., who was appointed March 4, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be pension agent at Topeka, Kans., vice Wilder S. Metcalf, term expired.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John J. Deane, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at San Francisco for the unexpired part of his term of four years from February 4, 1910, when appointed receiver at Oakland. Land office transferred from Oakland to San Francisco May 1, 1911.

Ira L. Bare, of North Platte, Nebr., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at North Platte, vice William H. C. Woodhurst, term expired.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Truman G. Daniels, of California, to be register of the land office at San Francisco for the unexpired part of his term of four years from May 17, 1910, when appointed register at Oakland. Land office transferred from Oakland to San Francisco May 1, 1911.

John E. Evans, of Nebraska, to be register of the land office at North Platte, Nebr., his term having expired February 11, 1911. (Reappointment.)

Albert Kircher, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Miles City, Mont., his term having expired February 25, 1911. (Reappointment.)

Reuben N. Stevens, of Bismarck, N. Dak., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Bismarck, vice Marshall H. Jewell, deceased.

James G. Quinlivan, of Dickinson, N. Dak., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Dickinson, vice Sylvanus M. Ferris, term expired.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

W. E. Walker to be postmaster at Biggs, Cal., in place of Virgil Bunnell, deceased.

FLORIDA.

Susie M. Bryan to be postmaster at Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

IDAHO.

William S. Brainard to be postmaster at Wardner, Idaho, in place of William S. Brainard. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1910.

Fred F. Evans to be postmaster at Burke, Idaho, in place of Fred F. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

ILLINOIS.

William Knigge to be postmaster at Rockefeller, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

IOWA.

James D. Hicklin to be postmaster at Wapello, Iowa, in place of Edwin Hicklin, resigned.

L. H. Hinkley to be postmaster at Sigourney, Iowa, in place of William H. Needham. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

Erastus T. Roland to be postmaster at Eldon, Iowa, in place of Erastus T. Roland. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

C. E. Wallace to be postmaster at New Sharon, Iowa, in place of Hervey J. Vail. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

KANSAS.

James A. Schilling to be postmaster at Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of John P. Lang, removed.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas Symson to be postmaster at Franklin, Ky., in place of Thomas Symson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1910.

LOUISIANA.

Richard E. Hodges to be postmaster at Jena, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

MAINE.

Whitfield B. Hallett to be postmaster at Ashland, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

MISSOURI.

Joseph H. Harris to be postmaster at Kansas City, Mo., in place of Joseph H. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

NEW YORK.

Edith Wallace to be postmaster at Lisbon, N. Y., in place of Charles G. Wallace, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George E. Childs to be postmaster at Kenmare, N. Dak., in place of Victor A. Corbett. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1910.

OHIO.

John Shaw to be postmaster at Leroy, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

OREGON.

E. R. Ware to be postmaster at Echo, Oreg., in place of John Dorn, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James H. Wells to be postmaster at Wilcox, Pa., in place of James H. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1911.

TENNESSEE.

Albert L. Scott to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of Albert L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1910.

TEXAS.

J. F. Henry to be postmaster at Stratford, Tex., in place of Robert B. Kerr, resigned.

Wilson I. Lawler to be postmaster at Deport, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Frank E. Osborn to be postmaster at McAllen, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WASHINGTON.

Thomas Bollman to be postmaster at Cashmere, Wash., in place of Thomas Bollman. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

James Cadzow to be postmaster at Malden, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Walter W. Cloud to be postmaster at Conconully, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Elliott S. Moore to be postmaster at Ione, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward O. Harwood to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Frank A. Everhard to be postmaster at Ripon, Wis., in place of John T. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1910.

George R. Hall to be postmaster at Oconto, Wis., in place of George R. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1910.

Albert B. Leyse to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of Joseph J. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1910.

Edward S. Minor to be postmaster at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., in place of F. J. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1910.

Earle S. Welch to be postmaster at Eau Claire, Wis., in place of Earle S. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 13, 1911.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Maurice Maschke to be collector of customs for the district of Cuyahoga, Ohio.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. Cecil Maunsell Gabbett to be first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Third Lieut. Roy Percival Munro to be second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Leland E. Cofer to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Passed Asst. Surg. Hugh S. Cumming to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

George Parcher to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

POSTMASTERS.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin Apple, Sunbury.

Mary J. Ensign, Ardmore.

Daniel J. Gensemer, Pine Grove.

Charles L. Ferrebee, St. Clair.

Isaac N. Lightner, Ephrata.

VIRGINIA.

Joel W. Hortenstine, Abingdon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 13, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. KAHN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Francis M. Comba, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. GREENE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William S. Green, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 3), ordered to be printed.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have consent to file the views of the minority (H. Rept. 3, pt. 2) on the bill just reported.

The SPEAKER. How long a time does the gentleman ask?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I agreed with the gentleman from Pennsylvania this morning that he should have unanimous consent to file the views of the minority any time up to the time the bill is disposed of in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]? There was no objection.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees. The Clerk proceeded with the call.

When the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress was called:

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress I desire to call up House joint resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] what arrangement he is willing to make as to time to debate this most important question?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes, sir. I presume it is on the same question.

Mr. MANN. I would ask the gentleman if he would not be willing to let this matter go over for a day or two. There will be plenty of opportunity to take it up. The gentleman knows that one resolution was reported into the House on this subject at the last session, and the gentleman himself introduced a resolution on the first day of the session. Now another resolution is reported in. All of these differ. Inasmuch as this is a proposed amendment to the Constitution, it seems to me that we ought to have full opportunity to consider the verbiage of it, at least.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, answering first the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], I say that, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to agree on a reasonable time for debate.

In answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], while it is true, Mr. Speaker, that various resolutions, all looking in the same direction, have from time to time been introduced and from time to time have passed the House, it seems to me that there is no reason for delaying this matter, because if the Representatives here have convictions on any great public question, they have them on this.

Mr. MANN. But, if the gentleman will pardon me, I do not ask for delay so far as the general principle is concerned and is involved, and would not do so. Members are prepared to vote upon that. But as to the language which is to be employed in amending the Constitution, where different language may be subject to different constructions, it seems to me that the House ought to be given full opportunity for consideration. I will suggest to the gentleman that there are some provisions in the joint resolution as reported which seem to me susceptible of different constructions. I think the gentleman himself would desire to have it perfectly clear and beyond question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the trouble about it is, I say, in answer to the gentleman, there are some people in the United States who want to be so perfectly clear about every question pertaining to this great and important piece of legislation that it is almost impossible to reach a time when we will have absolute unanimity of agreement, and therefore I think we ought to proceed to-day.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but ought not we to have a fair opportunity to make suggestions in reference to it in time to consider these suggestions?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will try to secure all the time necessary or desired for deliberate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. You can not do that unless you give us time to examine it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give ample time to debate it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody over here who can hear a word that is said by the gentlemen who have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will cease conversation so that the Members can hear this discussion. The Chair would like to hear it himself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why any Member of the House is not just as much interested in the discussion as the Members who have the floor.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will keep still there will be no difficulty in hearing.

Mr. MADDEN. I can hear as well as any other Member of the House. If the gentleman who has the floor will raise his voice high enough, all the Members can hear.

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman is already sustained. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire when this bill was introduced?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the 4th day of April, 1911. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated that the resolution was introduced on the 4th day of April. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman's resolution was not introduced on the 4th day of April. He introduced a resolution on the 4th day of April on this subject, but that resolution is not the one that was reported to the House.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. When was the resolution reported?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will permit, I would like to say a word about the parliamentary situation.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman for a question with reference to the division of time. If gentlemen will indicate how much time is desired for debate on that side, we will try to give it to them.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman if he thinks the House has had a fair opportunity to become acquainted with this measure, in view of the fact that the committee which reported it was appointed only day before yesterday in the afternoon, and that only late that evening were the notices sent out for the committee meeting.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield to the gentleman for a speech. I yielded to him for a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question which contains but one sentence. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer it.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The notices were sent out that night and did not reach the Republican members of the committee until after this meeting was held, with but one exception.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The call for a meeting of the committee was sent out in ample time. And not only that, but the notice reached every gentleman's office and was on his desk, and if gentlemen did not go to their offices until after the committee's meeting, it is no fault of mine.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I have not made any reflection on the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not see what else it can be.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. But those notices reached nobody,

because nobody expected them. This is a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, and nobody has had opportunity to study it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield further to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. For a question of one sentence. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman when the report was printed and ready for distribution in this case?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The Clerk can inform the gentleman. I do not know.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask if it was not within the last 30 minutes?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It is likely so. Now, Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about gentlemen who are determined to give us Democrats a whole lot of trouble during this extra session, and I, for one, invite them now to do their worst, and, in the language of Shakespeare, I say to them:

Lay on, Macduff;
And damn'd be him that first cries, "Hold, enough!"

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not intend to allow this matter to be sidetracked to gratify the desire of gentlemen who think they may want days or weeks in which to consider it. We have been considering it for years. This identical measure was before the Senate last winter, nearly all winter, and every gentleman here has convictions upon it.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will indicate how much time he wants for debate, I will try and agree. Otherwise I am going to demand the previous question on the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman going to give any opportunity for amendment?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, I will, if gentlemen want to debate the question. If not, I want to pass the resolution.

Mr. MANN. We desire a chance to consider, debate, and amend it, and the gentleman ought to afford us that opportunity.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that if there is any responsibility for passing this measure at this time—a measure that the American people have been demanding for four decades—the responsibility rests here, and we are going to pass a resolution to-day to elect United States Senators by the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If gentlemen on that side want a reasonable opportunity for debate and amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has indicated that he is ready to come to an agreement. If you do not want it, say so, and we will proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. In the last Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] introduced a joint resolution on the subject, which was reported to the House favorably. It came up for consideration by unanimous consent. I objected to the unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution at that time, and was very severely criticised by that side of the House. Now, this resolution is very different from that joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman from Illinois is not responsible for it if he does not vote for it. We assume the responsibility if we vote for it.

Mr. MANN. That is true; but does the gentleman mean to say that in amending the Constitution both sides of the House should not have the fullest opportunity for consideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I have just stated, the gentleman from Missouri has proposed to give that to you.

Mr. MANN. At the last session of Congress gentlemen on that side of the House favored a certain joint resolution on this subject. They now have an entirely different joint resolution on the same subject, and yet do not desire to give, as it seems to me, a full opportunity for consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that the entire resolution does not embrace 12 lines of reading matter; that any Member of this House can read it in one minute, that this question has been thrashed out and considered for years in this House, and if the gentleman wants a reasonable time for debate, or a

reasonable time to offer amendments, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has stated that he would like to have you make a proposition, and say what time you want.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course it is unnecessary to discuss the question as to whether it is to go over or not. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has stated that he did not propose to let the bill go over. He intends to proceed with its immediate consideration. The question now is as to whether or not gentlemen on that side of the House desire to agree to a reasonable time, within the limitations of to-day's debate.

Mr. MANN. There is no necessity for an agreement about time. The gentleman has the power at any time to move the previous question on the passage of the resolution, and undoubtedly has the power to carry it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Missouri will have to move the previous question at the end of an hour. I understand he does not desire to take advantage of that right, if there is a desire for more debate and opportunity for amendment on that side of the House. If that side of the House want more time they can get it. If not, the gentleman from Missouri can go ahead and use his hour and yield such time as is requested on that side of the House, and at the end of the hour move the previous question, but we do not desire to do that if you will indicate a reasonable time.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Missouri can reserve a minute or more of his hour and take the floor and move the previous question at any time. Does the gentleman from Missouri propose to give any opportunity for amendment?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is the gentleman addressing his question to me?

Mr. MANN. To either gentleman; I suppose the gentleman from Missouri is the one to answer.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer the gentleman if his inquiry is addressed to me. A colloquy has been going on for some time and the gentleman has been using my name frequently, and if he desires to ask a question I will answer it.

Mr. MANN. I asked the gentleman from Missouri the same question a while ago.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And the gentleman from Missouri said yes. The trouble about it is that some gentlemen have objected to things here so long and so often that they have become chronic objectors, and are never quite ready to vote on any question supposed to confer a power or respond to a demand of the people.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have heard that so often that it is not new to me.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And the gentleman will hear it again unless he reforms.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Missouri is not likely to reform my methods.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if he wants two hours of debate on that side, or three, or four, or a day?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have had so little opportunity to consult with gentlemen upon this side that it is difficult to know how much time will be consumed; but in view of the importance of the matter, and in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who I suppose spoke by authority, that this matter is going to be concluded to-night, anyway—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was speaking with the authority of the gentleman from Missouri, who has the bill in charge.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan (continuing). I will ask for at least four hours' general debate—two hours upon a side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I correctly understood the gentleman, I will ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed on this resolution for four hours—two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan and two hours by myself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to know whether amendments to the resolution will be in order at any time during the general debate or whether amendments must be offered while the bill is being read under the five-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Amendments are not in order during general debate.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will not include in his request some provision about amendments? I am not anxious to extend the time of debate, but he

can just as well include in his request that amendments shall be in order during general debate or at the close of general debate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have no objection to gentlemen offering such amendments as in their judgment they think proper during the two hours of debate.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose the gentleman includes that in his request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not think it is necessary to include it in the request.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is, from the statement just made by the Speaker, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think, in view of the statement made by the Speaker to the effect that amendments will not be in order during general debate, that we ought to have some understanding that amendments can be presented and have them pending, even though they may not be considered until the end of the general debate and during the reading of the bill?

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman can read any amendments he desires to offer in his own time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I desire to say to the gentleman from Illinois that he, or any other Member, can read any amendment he desires to offer in his own time. That is all that should be required.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not suggest that I wanted to read an amendment, but that I wanted some method suggested by which amendments could be introduced and have them pending for consideration while the bill was being read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to ask a question, if the gentleman will yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois seems to be quite anxious to amend this resolution, and I would like to ask him if it is his purpose to support the resolution for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I do intend to support the resolution, and I am not sure that I want to offer an amendment to it, but I may, and I desire to have that opportunity—

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. But, Mr. Speaker, I am answering the question of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I understood the Speaker to state, in answer to a parliamentary inquiry of my colleague, that amendments would not be in order by a gentleman who obtained the floor in so-called general debate. That rule is undoubtedly true of course as to debate in Committee of the Whole, but this is a House bill on the House Calendar, and any Member obtaining the floor, as I recall the rules and precedents, may offer an amendment and have it voted upon unless a different arrangement is made.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making a point of order or propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I simply call that to the attention of the Chair. I think the Chair was in error in the statement, evidently having in mind general debate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to repeat the request for unanimous consent which I made a moment ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed for four hours, two hours of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] and two hours by myself, and that during the general debate any gentleman having the floor for the purpose of discussing the matter may offer amendments in his own time, and those amendments will be considered as pending; and at the expiration of four hours the previous question to be considered as ordered on the resolution and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate proceed on this resolution for four hours, half the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]; that during that debate any Member shall be permitted in his own time to offer an amendment and have it considered as pending, and that at the end of the four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and pending amendments.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Of course, I suppose it is understood that my request is that the previous question shall be considered as ordered when the general debate ceases, even if it does not run for four hours.

The SPEAKER. Certainly. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Missouri begins—I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman after he begins—I desire to say that I voted for a similar resolution some time ago, and have voted for it two or three times; and I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will not, for my benefit and the benefit of others here who have thus voted, kindly explain the difference between this resolution and the resolution that was passed in the House the last time the subject was before the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am going to consume but a few minutes' time in the discussion of this question. Some criticism has been made here that we are proceeding with undue haste, and suggestions have also been heard that the report accompanying this resolution was printed within the last hour or two; that the resolution itself was only introduced during this session of Congress and within the last 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, charged with responsibility to faithfully serve a great constituency, on the first day that this House convened, the first hour it was possible to do so, I introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. On the second day of this session this resolution was introduced. Just as soon as the committees of this House were formed I sought to advise members of the committee that this measure would be considered, and invited their attendance upon a meeting of the committee.

If there is blame to attach because members of the committee which reported this resolution have not had more time for consideration, it is not due to any fault of the committee on committees, which announced the make-up of the Democratic side of all the committees of this House even before the House met, but it is due to the committee on committees on the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who took until last Tuesday, day before yesterday, as I understand, to announce his committees.

But I am not going to discuss that; neither will I be drawn into a discussion of the fact that various changes from time to time have appeared in the language employed in these several resolutions which have been introduced. Let me say in a general way all of those resolutions present a similar thought and had a common purpose. They all respond to a sentiment in this Nation which is as wide as the Republic, a sentiment which permeates our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a sentiment which is compelling Representatives to respond to public will. The deliberate judgment of the people of the United States, of the great mass of the people, demands that we reform the method of electing Senators by changing from a system which has sullied the fair names of States and traduced the character of gentlemen who have sought and won high political honors. The people demand that Senators of the United States who serve them in the highest legislative tribunal in the world shall be elected by a direct vote and shall respond to the will of the people. Gentlemen dilate upon the great constitutional questions involved—and they are great questions—and who admonish us to prudence and deliberation, forget that for 20 years or more the people of the United States have compelled obedience to their will in this Chamber and secured the passage of innumerable resolutions through this House.

There has been grave difficulty, I grant, for the people to reach the ear of all public servants. Just as you remove in point of distance a man charged with great responsibilities from the source which gave him power, just to that extent you diminish the opportunity of those who confer the power to get a response to popular appeal to that public servant. We stand with the great rank and file of the American people, and demand that this very day the House shall again go on record in favor of this great reform measure, pledged in platforms and advocated by leading spirits in all political parties. I trust the House of Representatives will again, and on this day, send greetings to the American people that we yield to their desires and cheer-

fully respond to their demands by sending to the Senate of the United States a resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which the people will be able to vote directly for United States Senators. As to the form of the resolution, I desire to state that according to my information the pending resolution has received more consideration in another body, has been more deliberately, dispassionately, and intelligently discussed there than any other resolution on this subject ever submitted to either House of Congress, and that by reason of and on account of the fact that this identical resolution was fully and ably discussed in that body during the last session, and because it secured such a large support there, a support which will be augmented, I believe, by others who are now Members of that body, thus making the passage of this resolution an assured fact, your committee has accepted it and recommended its adoption by the House.

For these reasons largely, and because of its own merits, we have seen fit to report here in identical words the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Judiciary during the last session of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the last time this resolution, or a similar resolution, passed this House—

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether there is any possibility of gentlemen on this side having an opportunity to hear what is going on in this Hall?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that the House is not in order. The point is well taken. Gentlemen upon this side of the Hall have a right to hear the debate, and those who desire to converse will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Missouri begins, I want to say this—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The speech the gentleman is going to make is a good one, but I can not yield right now.

Mr. RAKER. I am not going to take up any time, but it seems this part of the Hall here—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is not in order.

Mr. RAKER. But the gentleman yielded.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman refused to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the last time a resolution similar to this passed this House it passed under suspension of the rules and was declared to have received two-thirds of all the votes cast, but, as a matter of fact, it received about seven-eighths of all the votes.

Before that, and only a few years ago, a similar resolution passed the House, and my recollection is that on a viva voce vote there was not a single vote cast against its passage. In other words, I believe that for the last 15 or 20 years public sentiment has been crystallizing around this great question, a question so important, I think, to the future of this great Republic that gentlemen here will gladly respond to public will and to their conception of duty and vote this resolution up to the other end of this Capitol.

Believing that this measure will receive practically unanimous support, and believing that every gentleman here on both sides of this Hall who is really in favor of this great reform, who really wants to see the Constitution amended as proposed, will vote down every amendment offered, either by gentlemen on that side or by gentlemen on this, I now ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] to consume a part of his time, and I reserve the balance of my own.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to consume very much of the time of the House upon this proposition. This House has on several occasions passed joint resolutions in favor of the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. I take it that the sentiment upon that question is overwhelmingly in favor of the proposition on both sides of this Chamber. And it is not any part of my purpose to oppose that feature of this resolution.

At the last session of Congress, as I recollect it, a resolution in favor of election of Members of the Senate by the direct vote of the people was passed in this body without a division. But, sir, this resolution goes much further than that, and I wish the House to know exactly what they are doing when they vote upon this resolution. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has said that this resolution is the same as that which was reported to the Senate by Senator BORAH last winter, but he has omitted to say that it is a very different proposition from that which was finally submitted to the Senate and upon which the final vote was taken. This resolution provides for an amendment of section 4 of Article I, paragraph 1, of the Constitution. That has nothing to do directly with the question

of whether the people should themselves vote for Members of the Senate or whether they should be chosen by the State legislatures.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman has stated that this resolution as now proposed is not the same one that was voted upon in the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. Now, that is true; but is not this the same resolution that was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate before it was amended there?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has already said that, and I have said that.

Mr. JAMES. I thought you ought to put that in your remarks so that your side might know that their own party reported this proposition in the Senate, which is identical to the one here offered now.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. If the gentleman had been giving his usual attention, he would have heard me say it.

Mr. JAMES. I do not think the gentleman was as clear as he usually is or I would not have drawn the deduction I did.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Section 4 of Article I of the Constitution, paragraph 1, which it is proposed to amend, is in the following language:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The effect of this amendment now proposed is to strike out the portion of the Constitution which gives to the Congress of the United States if it desires the right to regulate the election of Senators in the States, a power which has been held by the Congress of the United States since the formation of the Constitution and which at some future time it may be extremely necessary that it should exercise.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Martin]?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The effect of the adoption of the amendment in the form proposed in this resolution would be to create the condition by which Congress would still have power to regulate the election pertaining to Members of the House and not of the Senate, would it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I wish to say that I do not know. And I have studied the language as far as I have had opportunity to do so. I think it was undoubtedly the intention of the men who framed this provision to leave that power over the election of Representatives. But I do not know whether they have done it or not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It would certainly leave no power as to the election of Senators with Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Absolutely none. If the words of the amendment to the Constitution which it is proposed to adopt are approved by a sufficient number of States, it would in terms take away the power even to regulate the election of Members of this House, and I am not sure whether that is cured by the words of the resolution, which are as follows:

That in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the time of holding elections for Senators—

And so forth.

That is in the resolution. It is not in the amendment. The language of the amendment would apply to both, and it is attempted to cure that by this ambiguous language.

Now, sir, nobody can foresee the future. Nobody can tell how necessary it may be in the future in some State or States of this Union for Congress to have the power of regulating the election of Senators of the United States.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman if he has prepared an amendment to cure this apparent defect?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I shall offer an amendment, now that the gentleman has suggested it. I will do it at this point, and I will ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk and be considered as pending.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, on page 1, line 7, all after the word "vacancies" up to and including the word "Senators," in line 10, and, on page 2, by striking out all of lines 9, 10, and 11.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will mark that as "Amendment No. 1."

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KENDALL. Before the gentleman proceeds further, I want to inquire whether, if his amendment were adopted, it would restore this resolution to the condition it was in when it was voted upon in the Senate?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Absolutely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave to withdraw the amendment just offered and submit it in a little different form, reciting the language. But it is of the same effect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his first amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask that the modified amendment be read at the desk and considered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend as follows:

Strike out on page 1 the language beginning in line 7, as follows: "And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators."

And strike out on page 2 the language beginning in line 9, as follows: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

Mr. CALDER. That makes it clear.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if that is substantially what is known as the Sutherland amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It is absolutely the same as the Sutherland amendment.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. That would preserve to the people the right to vote directly for a Senator, but it would retain in the Congress the authority to fix the time, place, and manner of election?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Not the place, I should say. The time is excepted.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that the amendment affects the right of the States to prescribe the qualifications of voters who vote for United States Senators, and the administration of the laws relative to such elections, and the power to appoint officers to superintend the election of United States Senators; and will it not authorize Congress to authorize and control the officers of the election of United States Senators, such as clerks, United States marshals, and other officers to supervise them?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I would not attempt, in the little time that I have for the consideration of this matter, to say just how far the authority of Congress would go under that amendment, but I will say this to the gentleman, that it would be just exactly the same as it is to-day, that there would be no difference; that it simply leaves in the Constitution a provision that is there now.

Mr. BARTLETT. With reference to what—with reference to Representatives?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. No; Representatives and Senators.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, it is the purpose of this amendment, as I understand it, whether expressed in so many words or not, to vest in Congress, or, as the gentleman has put it, to leave in Congress, as he now construes the Constitution to mean, the full, exclusive, plenary power to regulate everything with reference to the election of United States Senators.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It leaves the same power that we have at present, no more and no less; the power under which this Government has existed ever since the Constitution was adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit another question—

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sorry my friend is not a little more frank about the matter. I do not charge him with not being sincere, but—

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Oh, if the gentleman's party friends had given us a little more time to consider this matter I might have been able to give a more complete answer to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to say that I favor this resolution as it has been introduced; and I am sorry that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and his party associates on the committee and in the House have not all the time that they deem reasonably necessary. If I had it in my power, on every important question I would give you full opportunity to amend and discuss; but I want to say to the House and to the gentleman, that if that amendment is adopted I think there are many of us who will under no circumstances vote for this resolution with that amendment upon it.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I am not surprised at the statement of the gentleman. It discloses a state of affairs which I had suspected, that there are some gentlemen in this House who are not in favor of the election of Senators by the people, and yet, who will vote for this proposition if they can have combined with it the other proposition, to leave it absolutely in the power of a corrupt State to defeat the will of the people and to defeat the will of this body, while the American Congress stands by utterly helpless. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I should like to inquire where, in the opinion of the gentleman, these corrupt States are?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Many States at times have been corrupt.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Shake not your gory locks at us. You can not find them in the South.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It has been charged by southern gentlemen at times.

Mr. CLAYTON. Some of the Southern States were corruptly governed during the reconstruction period by the Republican Party and carpetbaggers and scoundrels put in charge of the State governments of the South by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do not care to be drawn into all of these side issues, but I wish to say just one word about the manner in which this resolution appears here; and I want to say, in the first place, that I do not cast any reflection of unfairness upon the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], the chairman of this committee, or his party colleagues, but I do think they have acted with undue haste in forcing this important matter before this body with so little chance to consider it. Of course I do not think that this body needs much time to consider the principal proposition, the election of Senators by the people, but it does need time to consider the language which shall be written into the Constitution of the United States to endure, perhaps, for ages. This Committee on the Election of President and Vice President was appointed day before yesterday in the afternoon. That evening the gentleman from Missouri sent out notices for a meeting the next morning at 10 o'clock. Many gentlemen, like myself, had public business in the departments that morning, and we did not reach our committee room until after this meeting had been held. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DANFORTH], a member of the minority, reached there a few minutes before the committee concluded its proceedings.

I charge no bad faith, I charge no attempt to prevent the minority's being present, but the effect of it all was that the matter was not considered by either side of the House with any degree of care, and if it had been, I do not believe the resolution would have come in here with such crudities of language in it as appear in many instances. I hope that the gentlemen on the other side of the House will forego their desire to take from the Congress of the United States the power, in any event, to regulate the election of Senators, that they will permit this amendment to be adopted and the resolution, substantially as introduced except in that respect, to pass. [Applause.] I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as long as I have a voice and vote in this House I shall stand for all reforms demanded by the patriotic and intelligent voters of the country. During my four years of service in this body I have consistently and persistently fought all forms of special privilege intended to benefit the few at the expense of the many. I have vigorously opposed all propositions to raid the Government Treasury by the granting of subsidies and have insisted upon an economical administration of the affairs of government to the end that the burdens of the people may be lightened.

The country is to be congratulated upon the fact that the present Democratic membership of the House stands as a unit against the evils I have enumerated and has already shown its good intentions and devotion to the people and to the country by cutting down the expenses of the House over \$182,000 per year; and this is but a drop in the bucket as compared with what we will save the people when the various departments of government are placed on a business basis. We are going to practice what we preach by reducing the cost of government to its actual needs.

And now we come to another great reform—the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a joint resolution in the Sixtieth Congress, reintroduced it in the Sixty-first Congress, and again introduced it on the first day of this session proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people. The resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendments be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:

"SEC. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph one: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution shows where I have stood for several years on this great and important question. I am one of those who believe the people can be trusted, and the closer the relationship between the Government and the people the better it will be for all concerned. In my judgment the nearer a governmental agency is to the source of power the greater will be its value, probity, and efficiency. Direct responsibility results in honesty, and good faith sustains the wavering, lends encouragement to the timid, and exposes and defeats the unworthy, incompetent, and corrupt. The tendency of government the world over is toward the people. The movement is gradual, but continuous and persistent; there has been no backward step; no retrogression or recession. Without haste or thought of retracing our steps we have moved forward in the direction of liberty and the closer relationship between the people and the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House is one of great importance. It is a long step in the right direction, and when enacted into law the will of the people will be supreme in the United States Senate. Wealth, plutocracy, and subserviency to the interests will no longer be the qualifications necessary for a Senator, but rugged honesty, recognized ability, admitted capacity, and wide experience will be required of those who occupy a seat in the highest lawmaking body of the land. I know, Mr. Speaker, there are some who style themselves as "watch dogs" of the Constitution, who come forward with a storm of condemnation whenever it is proposed to amend that document. I am free to confess that in my humble judgment no instrument in the history of the world compares with the Constitution of the United States, but Article V of the Constitution gives Congress the power of amendment, and this right has been exercised time and again as the exigencies demanded.

Both time and experience have shown that as a whole the Constitution is good and wise and the people have given it their heartiest approval; but devotion to the instrument itself should prompt us to make such changes as will insure to the people

the greatest degree of liberty. When those who formed this Government looked over the world they saw nothing but arbitrary governments; a monarchical form of government prevailed everywhere. Their experiment was great and grand, yet it was hazardous. They were determined, however, to form a government of the people. Some of them, realizing the splendid ability and the vast capacity of the American people for self-government, were willing to lay aside all of the shackles and forms of arbitrary government, but there were others who had less faith in the people for self-government and insisted on retaining some of the influences and agencies peculiar to a monarchical form of government. I believe experience has taught us that such agencies can safely be dispensed with and that we can with perfect safety bring the Government closer to the people by allowing them to vote direct for United States Senators.

Mr. Speaker, the present method of electing Senators has made the United States Senate the home of many men of great wealth, whose hearts do not beat in sympathy with the interests of the plain people and who never would have occupied a seat in that body if their election had been left to a direct vote of the people. We have reached a time in the history of the country when the Senate is no longer looked upon as the safe, conservative body, the so-called balance wheel, but is looked upon with dread and apprehension by the average American citizen, while the House, with all its faults and uncertainties, is regarded as the representative body of the American people, where can be heard the voice of the average citizen and where his rights will be protected and enforced. This condition is due to the fact that legislatures are frequently invaded by men of great wealth, shrewdness, and audacity, and the rights of the people give way to the exactions of corporate power; and he who can serve the corporations by controlling a legislature, through intrigue or persuasion, is regarded as fully equipped for service as a Senator, in which position he can guard and protect the interests of the corporation he serves. In this way the standard for the exalted position of United States Senator is debased by corporate influence. The wire-puller and the schemer are frequently preferred to the statesman and the patriot, and the proud title of United States Senator has lost much of its power in the suspicions which rest in the public mind as to the manner and conditions of their selection.

Mr. Speaker, when Senators are elected by the people there will be no legislative deadlocks, which in the past have not only resulted in scandal, but have frequently deprived certain States of an equal representation in this body. The Constitution provides that each State shall be entitled to two Senators, but during the past 20 years there has scarcely been a time when one or more States were not tied up in a deadlock over the election of a Senator, and therefore were deprived of their fair and equal representation. This was an injustice to the State and unfair to the whole country.

The present system has had an evil effect on the election of members of the legislatures. The two seats in the United States Senate for each State are highly coveted prizes in American public life, and as long as legislatures choose our Senators, those who covet these prizes will make it their business to choose members of the legislatures, and in this way much corruption and fraud will creep into our public life.

It has been said by another that the United States Senate of to-day may be likened unto the Roman senate of old. Rome, at the zenith of her power, boasted of the learning of her senators, which has been handed down to posterity and forms to-day the masterwork of the Latin tongue. But her senate became the goal of those who bought their seats with their gold, thus driving out the men whose brilliancy shone in brains alone; their laws began to decline; the people lost their virility; they lost their manhood and they lost Rome. Money is forever the same. Its one inherent quality in the social universe is cohesion. Its power wherever exercised is proportionate to its mass. Separated from the individuality of its owner it becomes a menace to the body politic, the destroyer of social equality and the creator of caste. The immortal Lincoln, with keen insight, foresaw the future of the United States Senate when he prophetically admonished his countrymen to "beware of the money power which seeks to perpetuate its reign until the wealth of the country has passed into the hands of the few and the Nation is lost."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the only way to remedy these evils is to so change the Constitution that the people may vote direct for Senators the same as they now vote for Members of the House. Every Member of Congress who believes in a republican form of government, a government by the people and for

the people, and who is in favor of preserving the sovereignty in the hands of the citizens will vote for this resolution. Its adoption will bring the Government closer to the people, will prevent corruption and scandal in State legislatures, will lessen the temptation of political parties to gerrymander legislative districts for partisan purposes, and will make United States Senators directly responsible to the individual citizen. We have recently passed a resolution providing for a great exposition to be held in the city of San Francisco to celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal, to which we have invited the nations of the world. How fitting it would be to signalize it by the submission and adoption of this amendment to the Constitution, thus publishing to the world that the greatest Republic on earth has given to its people direct control of the legislative department of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting voice.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I now yield 15 minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. Hobson].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], who has just spoken, and to his criticism of haste on the part of the committee, I wish, as a member of the committee, to state, as doubtless the chairman will later state at some length, that the question of consideration of this measure was taken up by the committee, and it was the unanimous view of the members present at yesterday's meeting, including members of the minority, that there would be no prejudice, no undue haste, in its consideration at yesterday's meeting, and in taking a vote at the same meeting. In view of the absence of several members, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], it was agreed by unanimous consent that though the vote of absent members would not affect the vote of the committee, they would be given the right to vote on the question and be so recorded by the committee.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT EVOLVED FROM MILITARY ORGANIZATION.

Mr. Speaker, this question involves the organic law of this land. America is the only country where there is, strictly speaking, constitutional or organic law. History shows that governments grew out of military organizations that were created primarily for the purpose of a better self-defense. They started when families in the face of common enemies stopped their own quarrels and organized clans. Out of these military organizations clan governments were formed. When clans, confronted by a common danger, submerged their differences and formed tribes, the larger military organization gave birth to tribal government. When great warring tribes, confronted by a common danger, united and formed nations, the still larger military organizations gave birth to the great monarchical governments of to-day.

Growing out of military systems the older governments of the world are patterned on military lines.

Anyone familiar with a military organization knows that power to be effective must be concentrated, must be lodged in a supreme head, whose authority is transmitted downward in gradual stages until it reaches the rank and file of the army. In this way every government of history, including the government from which ours sprang, originally lodged authority in a supreme head and in a hierarchy of nobility, practically excluding the masses of the people from civil as from military authority. The rulers, being human, and holding the power, naturally adopted the hereditary principle for its transmission and perpetuation.

EVOLUTIONARY TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY FROM RULERS TO THE PEOPLE.

When self-defense and war came to occupy not all but only a part of the thought of the Nation, the military principle in government began to yield to a growing demand of the people for a share in civil authority. As the normal condition of society steadily became more one of peace and less one of war the necessity for centralization of power steadily declined, and the demand of the people for participation in government steadily grew and gradually overcame the opposition of hereditary rulers, reluctant to part with power. It can be stated broadly that the progress of civil government has been a steady evolution of decentralization—the slow but steady passing down of authority from rulers to the people.

The fact of fundamental importance for us to remember at this juncture is that, in spite of setbacks due to revolutionary excesses in particular cases, the results have been beneficent, tending toward the progress of the world. The question for us to determine in passing upon this resolution is simply whether its provisions are revolutionary or evolutionary. If they are evolutionary, then the light of all history shows that they are wise and should be adopted.

THE CONSTITUTION AN EVOLUTION.

The fastest evolution has taken place in Anglo-Saxon lands, where the monarch and the nobility have been shorn of most of their power. At the time that our Government was founded a conviction had crystallized in the Anglo-Saxon world that the supreme civil power could be lodged safely in the hands of the people themselves [applause]; and when this Union was established, the supreme power of the land was lodged in the people and expressed in their organic law. As great as was the forward step in the adoption of the Constitution, it was evolutionary and not revolutionary, for our fathers in their wisdom fully realized the limitations and weaknesses of human nature, and the difficulties and dangers that naturally beset the practical operations of decentralized, popular government. The very organic instrument that lodged supreme power in the hands of the people provided in its practical operation for a double system of restraints, the restraints of subdivision, and the restraints of representative agents.

OURS A GOVERNMENT OF RESTRAINTS.

The two great divisions of authority are the individual States and the United States. The authority lodged in the people of individual States and in their governments constitutes a fundamental balance and check upon the exercise of the powers lodged in the Federal Government.

The powers of the Federal Government and, indeed, of all the State governments are further subdivided into three coordinate branches—legislative, judicial, executive. The legislative branch is still further divided into two houses, an upper and a lower house.

Restraint through the employment of representative agents is as largely developed as restraints through subdivision. All of the actual operations of government, as provided in the Constitution, are carried on through representative agents, and most of the operations are in the hands of agents chosen by agents. In only one house of one branch, the lower house of the legislative branch, are the agents chosen by the people themselves. Under the Constitution the upper house of the legislative branch and the executive branch are two degrees removed from the people, while the judicial branch is three degrees removed from the people.

With such a combined system of checks and restraints the Constitution of the United States in vesting the supreme power in the people and even permitting universal or manhood suffrage was only a step in evolution, and not a matter of revolution in Anglo-Saxon institutions.

REVOLUTION IMPOSSIBLE IN AMERICA.

In providing for changes or amendments the Constitution contemplated further evolution, and in the method of amending, the restraints and safeguards are so developed that violent and revolutionary changes are practically impossible.

In the evolutionary development of nearly a century and a quarter there has been no fundamental change in the system of subdivision of powers either between the Federal Government and the State governments or between the branches of the Federal Government or the branches of government in any State. The Federal Government is exercising its powers more and more and is entering fields that appear new, but in reality no new powers have been assumed. There is at times talk of usurpation of power on the part of one branch of the Government, but in reality no organic change or practice has taken place.

EVOLUTION RESTRICTED.

Evolutionary development has been confined and is now confined to extending the control of the people over representative agents. The first development was in the assumption of power to vote for the Executive, bringing this branch of government down to one degree instead of two degrees removed. It must be remembered, however, that though the people vote substantially for Presidents, the candidates are still chosen by conventions, or are two degrees removed, though individual States, Alabama first, and now Oregon, are giving the people opportunity to vote on their choice of candidates for the Presidency. This evolutionary development has been long in use, though without formal amendment to the Constitution, and its effects have been beneficial. The right to vote directly on candidates for the Presidency will doubtless be extended to all the States. The proposition now is to bring down the election of Senators to a direct vote, making these representative agents one degree instead of two degrees removed from the people.

DIRECT ELECTION OF SENATORS OVERDUE.

The power to do this has already been assumed by the people in many of the individual States, and the experience in each case has confirmed the conviction, which is now almost universal, that it should be extended in a formal way to all the

States. Such an amendment is clearly a step in the evolution of government; the time is clearly more than ripe for the step to be taken. There is no tinge of revolution in the proposition. The results could only be advantageous. It would be the part of wisdom for this amendment to be adopted and the people to be given this added control of elections.

I realize that men have always differed as to the part that the people should take in the affairs of government, and that this difference lies at the foundation of all party governments. One temperament, one type of mind, has more confidence in the masses of the people than the other type of mind. One type wants the Government conserved more as it has been, and that type forms the basis for the conservative party in every nation. The other type of mind wants the Government brought down more rapidly to the people; it is more liberal in its confidence in the people, and that type forms the basis for the liberal party in every government. There may be changes of the names, there may be many parties springing up for particular purposes at particular times, but in the long evolution of government in all countries where there is a conception of popular government this will be the fundamental dividing line between the two great parties.

ONLY REACTIONARIES CAN OPPOSE MEASURE.

The time is so ripe for this step—the election of Senators by direct vote of the people—it has been so thoroughly considered and so widely tried out in individual States; it is such a comparatively short step and so in keeping with the manifest evolution of our institutions that even the conservative element in our midst can freely accept it without misgiving. Only men of reactionary temperament can harbor misgivings.

It should be borne in mind that the amendment would have no effect upon the division of powers between the Federal Government and the individual States. It takes from the Federal Government no power granted by the Constitution; it takes from the States no power reserved by the Constitution. It alters not the balance of power as between large and small States, maintaining the equality of suffrage in the Senate, nor does it tend to any such disturbance, for Article V of the Constitution puts it beyond the reach of any amendment to reduce this equal suffrage for any State, large or small, without the consent of the State. Furthermore, the amendment does not alter the division of powers between the three coordinate branches of the Government. It only affects one form of the legislative branch, and the whole change in the legislative branch would not relatively be as great as the change in the executive branch by the direct voting of the people for the Presidents, which change has proved beneficial. The powers of the Senate remain unchanged; the term of office of Senators remains unchanged.

Some timid minds may have misgivings that the amendment would remove restraint upon the action of the lower House, needed to prevent hasty or revolutionary legislation in times of popular passion or enthusiasm.

PRACTICAL EFFECT.

Now, follow the course of a measure considered revolutionary, originating in this House in the midst of a great wave of popular enthusiasm. After passing this House it would go to the Senate. Two-thirds, at least, of the Senators would have been elected at times prior to the election of the Representatives, one-third two years prior, and one-third four years prior, which would antedate the wave of enthusiasm; moreover, one-third of the Senators would have terms extending two years beyond the terms of the Representatives, and one-third four years beyond. The Senate would still exercise the restraining function of a second branch and would still be a conservative second branch.

But even if such a measure passed both Houses of the legislative branch it would promptly come upon the check of the executive branch, with the veto power. If it should get beyond this obstacle and be placed on the statute books it would be subject to review by the Supreme Court, whose members are farthest removed from the influence of public clamor, holding their offices for life, and appointed by Presidents extending back over a long period. This Supreme Court would put the statute up to the test of the Constitution, and since this amendment does not affect the methods of amending the Constitution, and since these methods make hasty and revolutionary amendments almost impossible, it may be said that the proposed amendment still leaves it almost impossible to adopt revolutionary measures in our country. In fact, measures clearly in line with public policy, conservative changes recognized almost universally as advisable, find the inherent impediments in the way of constitutional amendment almost insurmountable. But for these impediments, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people would have been in operation for the last twenty years.

EVOLUTION PREVENTS REVOLUTION.

The difficulties, obstacles, checks, and restraints upon progressive changes in our Government are many fold greater than in the English Government. It is the slowness of response of the various representative agents, one and two degrees removed from the people, to the justified demands for progressive measures, that is causing the rapid growth of the movement for the initiative, referendum, and recall. Further failure to meet the growing demand for this movement will cause an inevitable growth of socialism. When evolutionary changes overdue are long withheld, then revolutionary measures grow in strength. Let not those who believe in representative government think they should oppose all changes. Further postponing the legitimate evolutionary step in the development of representative government as proposed in this resolution must inevitably discredit all representative government—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if I may have five minutes more?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman five minutes additional.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN SENATE SHAKEN.

Mr. HOBSON. It is no partisan spirit that constrains me to point out that the holding of power so long by one party has dammed up the stream of evolution until the waters of reform are overflowing. It is wiser to open the gate than to endanger the mill. In the blocking of legitimate reform, no agent has been more effective than the United States Senate. This very resolution is a good illustration. Thirty-one State legislatures have acted favorably, the House of Representatives has passed a similar resolution time and again, both great political parties have made it a part of their platforms, and yet the Senate still blocks the way. It is not overstating the situation to say that public confidence in the Senate has been seriously shaken and the most serious blows to public confidence have come through the present method of choosing Senators by the legislatures.

PRESENT METHOD INVITES CORRUPTION.

It can not be denied that the method of election by the small number who compose a legislature invites corruption from great moneyed interests seeking to secure or to hold unmoled the power to tax the American people by controlling the United States Senate, and invites corruption from men of great wealth seeking a similar power or seeking the honor and prestige of the office.

Nothing would so restore public confidence in the Senate as the adoption of this resolution, giving the election over into the hands of the people. It is high time to restore this confidence of the people if we would check the formidable growth of socialism in the land.

WOULD PROMOTE EFFICIENCY OF STATE LEGISLATURES.

It must be further admitted that the present method of election of Senators has been accompanied by an ever increasing frequency of demoralization in the State legislatures. Placing the election of Senators in the hands of the people would really restore to the people of the States a better control over their own legislatures; it would raise the standard of State legislators and turn the attention of the legislatures to the needs of the States. The passage of this resolution would thus profoundly promote the highest efficiency of both the Federal and the State Governments.

WOULD PROMOTE POLITICAL EDUCATION OF PEOPLE.

But even promoting efficiency in both of our divisions of Government, State and national, does not measure the full benefits of this reform. The greatest benefit of all lies in the fact that it would contribute fundamentally to the political and patriotic development of the people themselves. The great law of development is recurring exercise of the activities. The glory of free institutions and self-government is the development of the people through the exercise of the functions of government. It is wise even to go faster than the highest efficiency of the machinery of government would dictate, so that the people in making mistakes would learn from them and rise to higher planes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Would it be imposing to ask the chairman for three minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not believe I can give the gentleman that much time, but I will yield him one minute more.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, the action called for by this resolution is evolution. If we are wise we will not dam it up. The current of evolution dammed up too long brings the

flood of revolution. This reform is now overdue. Its delay has contributed to abuses and has shaken the confidence of the American people. The passage of this resolution is demanded by the highest considerations of efficiency of government, by the highest considerations of the welfare of the people, by the highest considerations of the orderly evolution of free institutions. The people realize this. They want this reform. They are entitled to it. I am heartily in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair asks the indulgence of the House for a minute. On the question arising this morning, whether an amendment was in order in general debate in the House, the Chair mixed up the rule in the House with the one in the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair asks leave to change the ruling in conformity with the rule, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Whenever the present occupant of the chair makes a mistake and it is called to his notice, he will correct it as swiftly as he made the mistake. [Applause.] Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the popular election of United States Senators, and so I shall vote for this resolution submitting to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing therefor. I wish we might have had a larger opportunity to consider whether some amendment could not wisely be made to it. It seems to me, for instance, that the proposed amendment should provide that the regular election of Senators shall occur at the regular State election to be held next before the vacancy occurs which is to be filled.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Under the language of this amendment the legislature could do that if it wanted to do so.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Under the terms of this proposed amendment the legislature can regulate the time for such elections. It is a question, however, whether the provision should not be in the organic law.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the gentleman is right about it.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I certainly hope that such an amendment may be adopted before the resolution passes.

There are those who are strongly opposed to the resolution because under its provisions Congress is deprived of its present power to regulate the time and place and manner of electing United States Senators. Personally, I would be glad to see that power retained in Congress. But, in my judgment, this is not a vital defect in the proposed amendment. The Constitution leaves to the legislatures of the several States the authority to determine how the presidential electors shall be appointed. For more than a hundred years, under this provision, the electors have been chosen by the people. The results have been satisfactory. If the States can be trusted in all matters relating to the election of presidential electors, they can surely be trusted in all matters relating to the election of United States Senators.

Our fathers in framing the Constitution undertook to safeguard the Republic by removing the selection of the Chief Executive from the excitement of popular elections. They believed that on election day the people in the several States would gather at the polls and elect their presidential electors, and that then these presidential electors would meet on the proper day and, away from the tumult and excitement of the populace, would select for the Chief Executive the one man in all the country whom they believed to be best qualified for the position. Their scheme was an utter failure. Nothing but the letter of the constitutional provision remains. To all intents and purposes the people of the several States register their will on election day, and the presidential electors whom they elect merely convey to the United States Senate the results of the election.

In a similar manner, they deemed it wise to remove the selection of United States Senators from the excitement of popular elections. They provided that they should be elected by the legislatures of the several States. This provision has already been nullified in many of the States, and the number of States nullifying it is rapidly increasing. The whole trend of public sentiment is in favor of the election of Senators by the people. If the several legislatures could be selected upon the sole issue of the election of such Senators, the situation would be very different. But such is not the fact. The legislatures are not selected for this purpose primarily. Many local issues, not infrequently burning questions, are involved in the election of these legislatures. For this reason, and for many reasons

which might be given, it has come to pass that too often the man selected by the legislature is not the choice of the people. It is desirable that there should be a uniform rule as to the time of electing these Senators, and I hope to see this resolution so amended as to provide for the date of such elections.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion there?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The constitution of my State provides that elections for State officers shall be held in years other than those in which Federal elections are held, the idea being to divorce the consideration of State and National questions that the people might vote more directly on the fitness of men for the positions which they seek; and I simply suggest that idea to the gentleman as contrary to the one he suggested a few moments ago.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. My suggestion is that provision be made for the election of Senators at the last general election, whether for Federal officers or simply for State officers, prior to the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the people thought when they framed the Constitution of the United States that they were forming and providing for a system of government through which and by which the people could rule, with such checks and balances as would prevent hasty, ill-considered, and revolutionary movements. No one at that time perhaps dreamed that United States Senators would be virtually elected by the people by being selected in a dominant party primary election held one, two, three, and in some instances four years before the term of office was to begin, and seven, eight, nine, and in some cases ten or eleven years before the expiration of the term of service of the United States Senator so selected. Political revolutions and political changes that are not revolutionary can and do take place in much less time than that. When a United States Senator is elected for this long time he has the power and the right under the Constitution to remain there and vote in all legislative matters in the Congress of the United States as he sees proper, although his action may be the very opposite to the then existing political sentiment of his State. From the fact that the agencies and instrumentalities of government, both legislative and executive, have not, in the opinion of the people, fully lived up to and abided by the popular will have grown up the doctrines of the initiative, referendum, and recall. These doctrines to a great extent have grown out of the failure of the instrumentalities of government, as provided by the Constitution, to carry out and duly reflect the will of the people, as the people themselves judge of that conduct.

But I want to say that the doctrine of the recall of a legislator is not new, is not recent. It is older than the Constitution itself. It was actually applied to the delegates in the provisional Congress of the colonies, before the Federal Congress under our present form of government was established, when the delegates held their offices for only one year. I want to read here Article V of the old Articles of Confederation:

ARTICLE V. For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States Delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its Delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

That is a part of the legislation in the nature itself of a constitutional provision older than the Constitution and older than the Populist Party, many times over. It is not a new doctrine. It was an idea so prevalent among the people of the Colonies that they provided for it in the Articles of Confederation as applicable to a legislative office that existed only for one year.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the committee was considering this resolution or I should have conferred with the chairman and members of the committee with reference to offering an amendment. But the chairman just stated a few moments ago that he was so anxious to get through this resolution in its present form, inasmuch as it had already been considered in another body, where it must pass if passed at all, that he did not want any amendment offered to it, and would ask that every amendment be voted down. Had it not been for

that request I should have offered an amendment to this joint resolution, beginning with line 5, on page 2, after the word "years." I will read first the resolution and then the amendment which I expected to offer and which I would offer now if it were not for the fact that I do not propose to attempt to change the resolution in any way by any kind of amendment offered here, however proper and however much I would like to support it, by a provision that does not meet with the approval of the gentlemen who have this matter in charge and who have looked over and surveyed the whole situation. The resolution reads:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Now, just following the words "six years" I intended to offer this amendment:

With a power reserved to each State to recall its Senators, or either of them, at any time within the period of their service and to send another or others in their stead for the remainder of such period, and the legislatures of the various States shall by appropriate legislation carry into effect this provision.

I think, in order to retain the confidence of the people in their legislators, their agents, their United States Senators, or even Members of this House, if necessary, whether elected by direct vote of the people or otherwise, they should have the power to dismiss their agents or other servants whenever in their judgment, properly and deliberately ascertained, they no longer represent the people who elected them. I think such a provision would tend to perpetuate our Government in strength; that it would not be an element of weakness. If revolution ever comes in this country, it will come, not because the people have not confidence in the form of government itself, in the principles upon which it is founded, but because they have lost confidence in those who are selected to execute their will in the method and manner as now provided. Who of you as a business man would without power of revocation authorize an agent to do business for 6 years, 8 or 10 years in advance of the finality of that business, with no power to dismiss that agent for misconduct or other cause? A State which is rock-ribbed in its democracy or in its republicanism may change, slowly, quietly, but decisively, after a United States Senator has been elected and before his term of office expires, and yet that Senator will continue there to misrepresent the people, not at the time he was elected, but at the time the act of representation must take place. I do not believe such a provision for recall will be otherwise than in accord with public sentiment. But I realize that this resolution must go through another body, and I appreciate the sincerity and honesty of statement by the chairman of this committee [Mr. RUCKER of Missouri] in not wanting to do anything that will give anybody an excuse to vote against the resolution in its main purposes and objects, that United States Senators shall be elected by a direct vote of the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, unless the chairman of the committee changes his mind, I will not offer this amendment and ask for a vote upon it; but it is time to think about these things.

Revolution can nearly always be prevented if we will only yield to proper public sentiment, even in a conservative way. If you think that this kind of sentiment is going backward, you are mistaken. It is coming. Call it populist or what you please, the doctrine of initiative, referendum, and recall is coming, and it is coming to stay. It is going to be a part of the national, State, and municipal legislation of this country; if not in the form now demanded, then in some way by which the same result will be reached.

The Constitution did not provide for direct election of the President of the United States, but we have it. It has been amended by the action of the people in the method of selecting party nominees and party candidates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULZER). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] prepared to use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think five minutes are quite as much time as I desire in which to discuss this House joint resolution. Heretofore I have voted for a resolution in some respects similar to this—two and perhaps three times. I am inclined to the opinion that the people voting directly for Senators would give as good results as are obtained when they are chosen by the legislatures under the provisions of the present Constitution, and perhaps better results. If I understand this joint resolution, however, I shall vote against it, for this reason: After providing the proposed amendment for the election

of Senators by the people, it proceeds further and amends section 4 of Article I of the Constitution. That section now reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

As I understand it, the last clause in that section is stricken out.

Mr. MANN. So far as Senators are concerned.

Mr. CANNON. So far as Senators are concerned. I am not so sure but what it is also stricken out so far as Representatives are concerned. But let that be as it may, I will not vote for such an amendment, containing such a provision.

You take my house when you do take the prop
That doth sustain my house.

The Federal Government of the United States, a Government of limited power, but supreme where power is granted under the Constitution, should always have the power to perpetuate itself without regard to what any State or any States may do in failing to perform their duty.

Let me put an extreme case, and what may happen in the future I do not know. Suppose a State secedes; suppose the man comes on horseback and tries to take the State out of the Union, and the State does secede in fact without regard to what might be the desire of the majority of the people. Is the United States powerless under the proposed amendment in that case to say that a Senator can not be chosen by an election authorized by Congress?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. If so, then the Government of the United States, so far as Congress is concerned, exists at the mercy of the States in the exercise of supreme power where supreme power is granted. I say again that I think this amendment applies to the House as well as to the Senate, but the Senate is a coordinate branch of Congress, and Congress can not exist under our Constitution without a Senate. Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for such a resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, it would be manifestly impossible for me to enter upon any extended discussion as to the merits of this resolution in the short space of five minutes allotted to me; but this question is not a new one; it has been discussed time and again, ever since and before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It therefore needs no great amount of time now for any gentleman to make up his mind how he should vote on the proposition. For myself, I have long been in favor of the direct election of United States Senators by the people themselves. I am on record in favor of that proposition. More than 30 years ago, in 1879, in the Legislature of the State of Illinois, I introduced a resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from that State to support a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators by the people. I have more than once introduced such a resolution in this House, and at the time I was first nominated for Congress I announced that as one of the planks in my platform and as a measure which I should advocate at every opportunity. I believe in the people and am willing to trust them at all times. I believe the people are and of right ought to be supreme in this Government, and that when they have fully studied and digested any question they are almost universally right. I know, and every man in this House and in this Congress knows, without any shadow of doubt whatever, that the great mass of the people of the United States are desirous of having adopted an amendment to the Federal Constitution that shall give them the right to say directly who their representatives in the Senate of the United States shall be. As a member of the Illinois General Assembly and State Senate it has been my fortune to have participated in six different elections for United States Senator, and at each time I have become more and more convinced that the election should rest with the people and not with the legislature. At one time in the legislature of that State, the two political parties being a tie, we balloted for more than four long months before a Senator was elected, and then his election was made possible by the fact that a member belonging to one party died and was succeeded by a member of the other party, thereby giving that party a majority. Of course, such a condition of affairs is not desirable, and could not by any possibility occur if the election was directly in the hands of the people.

At another senatorial election in which I participated, where two or three men held the balance of power, they were able to dictate the election of a Senator, and after a deadlock lasting several weeks the will of the majority was trampled under

foot and these two or three independent members were able to dictate the election of a United States Senator, although they represented only the smallest kind of a minority of the people of that State. True or false, justly or unjustly, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, or the great majority of them, have come to believe that it has occurred in not only one case, but in many cases, that great interests, great financial institutions combined, have dictated and corruptly controlled the election of United States Senators by the legislatures of more than one State. The people are now asking and demanding, regardless of party, all over this country that they shall have the right to say by direct vote who shall represent them in the Senate of the United States. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to give them that privilege, if it is their right; and if this country is to continue to be "the land of the free and the home of the brave," if it is to continue to be a government "of and by and for the people," if it is to continue to be the foremost leader in the civilization and progress of the world, we must see to it that in reality, as well as in theory, the people are supreme; that their wishes must be heeded, and public servants in the Senate and in all departments of the Government must be responsive to the will of the people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to appear as an advocate of this bill on the floor of this House following the distinguished ex-Speaker, Mr. CANNON, who has just taken his seat. I consider it a great honor to appear on the floor of this House to speak on the first bill reported to the House; I consider it a great honor to be on the committee that reported the first bill to a Democratic House in 16 years; but, sir, I consider it a still greater honor to stand on the floor, representing the people of the old red hills of the eighth congressional district of Georgia, delivering their message of almost unanimous demand that the United States Senators be elected by the people and calling on you to heed their demand.

Mr. Speaker, I would not rise to speak to-day, being a new Member of the House, except for the fact that an error has crept into this discussion in regard to the action of the committee. Being a member of that committee, I am familiar with what occurred in the committee room. I would correct the statement that only one of the minority side of the House was present, because there were two present who cast their votes, as the record will show, in the committee room. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee went to the telephone and tried to secure all the members of this committee, and did all in his power to secure full attendance, and it was the sense of the committee, after he had laid the matter before them, that we proceed at once, by reason of the fact that everybody throughout the Union is familiar with this bill, it having been oftentimes introduced in almost the same language in which it is here to-day and discussed in this House. Therefore I can see no reason why anybody could raise complaint of hasty action.

It seems to me that recent performances of the different legislatures in many States of the Union should convince any man that we have reached the stage in our national history when we should no longer allow legislatures to elect United States Senators. It is a well-known fact, although it is denied, that the interests, corporate interests, enter the floor of the house of the different legislatures frequently; that they influence the election of Senators. When men are elected to office it makes no difference whether they are Senators or ordinaries, or what position they occupy, when they get into office and come to discharge their duties they are naturally influenced by and sympathize with the people and the interests who elect them.

When you go to the farms and seek a vote for United States Senator, or for any other office, you find an unprejudiced voter generally. Most of the people are interested only in good government, and when they walk up and cast their votes they cast them for the man they think will represent the mass of the people and the interests of the people, and not the interests of a corporation or any other interest that may have secured his election on the floor of the legislature. As I said, I know it is denied that the interests and the corporations enter upon the floor of the houses of the legislatures of the different States, but there is no use to deny the truth. I can remember when I was a boy of hearing it charged in the State of Georgia, my own State, that good old pious State, that the general assembly in the eighties was tied up for weeks and months, and I can remember that it was asserted then that certain corporate interests tied up that legislature. That was denied, of course. One of the men who then participated and undertook to go to the

Senate against whom the charge was made that he had entered the floor of the house with his corporate interests and corruption fund backing him, afterwards moved to the State of California, and it was charged in recent years that he brought together the greatest corruption fund that was ever put up in the interest of legislation in this Union. Whether or not that is true I do not know; but these things were brought into the courts and criminal charges were made against him and he was tried. This history is well known of all men. [Applause.]

Sir, it was my privilege to introduce on the first day a similar bill to the one under consideration, which when enacted into law would read as follows:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be chosen by a direct vote of the people of the several States, for six years, and the electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and each Senator shall have one vote.

When vacancies occur in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the executive authority thereof shall make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

This amendment has no application to Senators chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution of the United States, and shall not be considered to affect the term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution.

The legislature in each State shall prescribe the manner, place, and time of holding the election by the people for Senator in the several States.

This bill is in substance the same as the one now under consideration, and I cheerfully adopt the chairman's bill. The people of this Union have demanded this legislation for a time the memory of we young men runneth not. It is no new question. It has been strengthened in the public demand by years of thought, sober and earnest deliberation. Resolutions by the legislatures favoring this bill have been sent here by 31 States. Extra sessions of the legislatures are often called in States to transact the State's business, the time of the regular session having been consumed by senatorial scrambles, and often the whole State is humiliated and demoralized by scenes in legislative halls. The strongest argument used against the bill is reluctance to change the framework of our Government. Our fathers in making the framework of the Government were confronted with the European forms of government and long precedents of centralized power. It was considered dangerous to load the new Republic with too many experiments, and there were many advocates of a monarchy.

The evolution of free government by the people demanded many changes from the old landmarks of the mother country. All men in those days were not prepared for a government by the people. Strong minds like Hamilton were battling for centralized government and feared the voice of the people expressed at the polls. Suffrage was almost unknown. Not one man in five hundred voted in the mother country. Time has proven that the people can be more surely trusted with the elective franchise than legislative bodies with the various interests camping on the floors of the Capitol. No one would charge corruption to legislative bodies as a whole. The report expresses clearly the thought I would here convey, it reads as follows:

No one contends for a moment that it is the universal practice or the general rule that legislatures are thus corrupted, but it must be admitted by all that if those who desire to corrupt enter the field at all, it is after the legislature has convened.

How often is it true that no taint of wrongdoing or corruption attaches to the election until the legislature has convened? The small number of parties to be controlled, the possibility of logrolling with different local interests, of trading this or that for votes, is tempting indeed to those who seek a senatorship, not upon merit, but through sinister means. In the early days of the Republic very few of the important offices, National or State, were filled by direct vote of the people. The President was named by an electoral college. Jefferson was elected both governor and Member of Congress by the State Legislature of Virginia. Many statehouse officers and all judicial officers were elected in the various States by the legislature. This era of our history is now relegated to the past, and almost the last remnant for legislative lobbying is the election of United States Senators. All officers are elected by direct vote of the people in all the States with a very few exceptions. The rule of the people, as exemplified in this Republic, has swept across the ocean; monarchies have crumbled before the demand of the people for freedom and suffrage, and even in countries where the throne was law the voice of the people is now heard in the land. Have gentlemen contemplated the fact that this office is oftentimes no longer a reward to men of true worth, true patriotism, and great ability? How many Senators come to this Senate on account of the influence exerted by their wealth and

the wealth of their associates—the giant corporations? Our forefathers did not confront this situation. We will act wise to grapple the situation that confronts us, they could not foresee our present needs. They did well for their country, what will we do? So, sir, I say, let every man, I do not care if he uses his pick and shovel to make his daily bread, be as free to cast his vote as the president of a steel trust in the election of the highest official of his State. We can no longer turn a deaf ear to the demands of the people.

The Democratic side of this House would do well to learn a lesson by the vacant seats on the Republican side. The Republicans have been warned time after time on the floor of this House that they were straying too far from the people. To this and other warnings they have paid no heed, and now, sir, I call you to witness how their ranks have been thinned and that many new Democrats are here from districts that have never sent Democratic Representatives here before. You can not ignore the just demands of the people. Fellow Democrats, the country will commend us in the organization of this House for heeding the general demand for retrenchment and reform in Government extravagance. The official force of the House was reduced to the extent in money total the sum of \$186,000. On the question of extravagance the people have appealed to this House, just as they have long been knocking at this door for the election of Senators by the people. What relief has the Republican Party offered to a tax-burdened people? Only 10 years have expired since the billion-dollar Congress was ushered upon the people. The country was stirred with indignation and alarm at such an enormous expenditure. In 1910 Congress appropriated \$2,206,774,016.01. This shows an increase of more than 50 per cent in 10 years. The increase since 1896 has been over 75 per cent. In this estimate the increased population is considered. The per capita tax in 1890 was about \$6, and it is now over \$12. It is estimated that there is one Government employee for every 21 voters. In the year 1850 the expense of the Government was \$60,407,019; population was 23,191,876; per capita, \$2.60. In 1910, expense of one year, \$1,103,387,508.01; population, 91,972,267; and per capita tax, \$12.60. The comparison staggers comprehension. I realize the fact that it takes an enormous amount of money to run the Government, and I am willing to appropriate the people's money if it serves the great mass of people. As an illustration of what is being appropriated, I refer you to the appropriation for Government detectives. In the Sixtieth Congress the gigantic sum of \$7,126,000 was appropriated for this purpose alone. Forestry is a question of no great magnitude, and yet \$4,000,000 was appropriated for forestry at last session. Such appropriations are conducive of little good. On the other hand, farming is and has ever been the backbone of this country, and yet the appropriation for agriculture in all the departments is only five million more than these two appropriations of spoil and plunder. The Republican Party was warned, even at the other end of the Capitol last year, and even by that great apostle of high tariff, Senator Aldrich, that the people would not always strive with the Republicans for economy. He said the Government could be run on a saving of \$300,000,000 every year. Taking this estimate as true, you are wasting more of the people's money than was required to run the Government 10 years after the Civil War.

For a decade the Republican Party has been under the lash of a few multimillionaires, arrayed like Solomon in all his glory, who toil not and neither do they spin, but have their toilers and spinners in the Republican Party. In serving that master the party has ignored the people. Now, sir, I warn the Democratic side of this House that the people have spoken at the polls and said, by leaving Republicans at home, that their demands shall be heard, and we must heed their demand by speedily passing this bill.

FEDERAL CONTROL.

The amendment looking to placing the election under Federal control is here for the purpose of frightening southern Representatives in States having legislative qualifications for electors. In this you propose to extend Federal authority, thus crushing forever the constitutional right the States have enjoyed from the foundation of the Government. We passed through the Civil War, the days of reconstruction, with no authority in the Federal Constitution to interfere with the manner of electing United States Senators, and yet in this day of peace and harmony you undertake to force upon the people of the South a new constitutional provision whereby Federal soldiers can be sent to camp around our election precincts. To make myself clear, the people elect members of the legislature with no Federal interference and none is provided under the provisions of the Constitution. These legislators so elected elect Senators

with no Federal interference and none is provided. Now, you propose to extend the provisions of the Constitution and throw around the elections of Senators Federal control. You are seeking to take from the States their constitutional right and centralize the power of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court has decided that the States can determine who should be registered and who should not be registered in the several States. This is a settled constitutional question. What man among you ever expects to see the day when Federal officeholders gather around election precincts in the South or any other State to say who shall and who shall not vote? Time after time the force bill has been here threatening the South, but long years ago it was driven from this House disgraced, disgraced, disowned, and denounced as infamous; no one to rise up and call its author blessed. Thus it sleeps in the potter's field a peaceful desertion. Is there a man in this House that desires to see the days of reconstruction repeated in the South? No; not one. No part of this Union outranks the South on the floor of this House, evidenced by the fact that you have given us an equal share of the honors and responsibilities in the Sixty-second Congress. Will the opening of our wounds never cease to be an agreeable performance to some of the Republicans from the other side of the House? From wrecks of fortunes and burning homes we have fought and regained our former prestige, and to-day the South is the garden spot of this Union. I can not believe any man in this House is sincere in pressing this amendment.

The day has been when such an amendment would have received strong and aggressive support, but that day is gone forever in this end of the Capitol, thank God. You men who injected this sectional issue in this question will feel the sting of repudiation when this vote is counted. This House has long since ceased to be a forum for an exhibition of skill in trampling upon the South. I warn you that instead of stirring up bitterness and hate in the hearts of your brethren from North, East, and West you have insulted their intelligence and brought down upon your own heads their just condemnation. If you be men, then rise up like patriots and strike down this amendment, which would destroy rights of a State and again carry back to the days of reconstruction our peaceful southern homes. Let us dwell together in union, forgetting that there is a North, South, East, or West, sympathizing with each other in the problems that confront us in the several sections.

We of the South have patiently and faithfully borne the burden of an inferior race; that we have borne it well is known throughout the civilized world. Other sections are being confronted with serious problems. To solve them you need our help and you will have it. No section can truthfully boast of more genuine loyalty to our Government or more pride in her achievements. Standing here on this floor, the home of the Union, where Hamilton and Jefferson, Webster and Calhoun, Stevens and Lincoln stood battling for what each honestly conceived to be a common heritage of freedom, I thank God the day has come when men who rise to the magnitude of statesmanship, even on the Republican side, despise any effort to gain public notice by attempting to inject sectional animosities into any question in this House. Sir, let us strike down the staff that waves this sectional banner, and let us banish even its shades forever from this House and bar eternally the doors to future reproach on the honor and integrity of the South. The defeat of the amendment to this joint resolution will send a thrill of joy to every southern home and return southern Representatives to their people to be greeted, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." [Applause and congratulations.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in his speech a moment ago stated that he was not so certain but what this amendment repealed the right now existing in the Congress of the United States to regulate the elections of Representatives in Congress. I submit that the gentleman had not read with much care the amendment, or he could not have made that statement with a very great deal of confidence, because the amendment reads as follows:

And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Not so far as it relates to the election of Members of the House of Representatives, but refers only to "Senators." This amendment in no way affects whatever authority or right Congress has to regulate that, and how the gentleman from Illinois could predicate his opposition upon the theory that it did affect the power of Congress to regulate the election of Members

of this House is not very apparent to me, nor, I do believe, to any one who will examine it with care.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The part of the resolution which the gentleman has read would form no part of the Constitution, would it, if this resolution should be adopted and the amendment adopted by the people?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, but that part of the amendment which I will read does control it, and that is this:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

Does the gentleman see anything in that which affects the right which Congress now has to control the election of Representatives in Congress, if it has any such right? There is no part of this amendment which refers in any way to Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Ah, but it is said that is in lieu of certain provisions in the Constitution.

Mr. JAMES. But it nowhere uses any language that according to a fair construction of it would be a foundation for a statement that this amendment undertakes to affect in any way the election of Representatives of this House.

I am for this amendment to the Constitution, and I regret to see in this House an effort made to try to bring up that old scare that has too long affected the affairs of political parties of this country. Let me warn you gentlemen of the other side of one thing. The southern people are handling now the subject of election of Senators and Members of Congress to the satisfaction of this House and to the approval of you yourselves, because you have never unseated a single Member by reason of the laws under which he was elected. The Supreme Court of the United States has approved the election laws under which they are now acting, and to try to place upon this amendment a provision that would mean its defeat—because it was placed upon it in the Senate and it meant its defeat there—almost forces me to question the good faith of those who propose it and to believe that the amendment is offered for no other purpose except to try to defeat the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. [Applause.]

I am in favor of the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people because experience has proved its wisdom. In the days when our Constitution was formed Gouverneur Morris was the spokesman of those who doubted the wisdom of the people to control themselves. Gouverneur Morris used this language, that the Senate should be made up of men of "great and established wealth," and that thus they might keep down the "turbulency of the democracy."

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to deny but that what Gouverneur Morris wished to do has been accomplished. The Senate has been made up of men of great and established wealth, but the rules of this House deny me the right to discuss its personnel, and I shall not violate them. But the one reason that spurs the people on in their advocacy of this amendment for the direct election of Senators by the people is to keep out of the Senate men of great and established wealth and allow the voice of the people to control and the reforms desired by them to be enacted into law.

I am one of those who do not fear the people. Gentlemen, the men who bear the guns that defend this Republic must bear the ballots that preserve it. [Applause.] I do not belong to that class in this country which says to the great populace, "You can shed your blood to keep the flag of the Republic in the skies, but you can not name the men who make the laws for you." [Applause.] I share the opinion expressed by the master mind of Thomas Jefferson when he uttered these words:

I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than those attending too slight a degree of it.

This is the ground rock upon which republics rest, and when maintained can not be shaken.

Mr. Speaker, some people seem to believe the Constitution of the United States should not be amended, and was not made to be amended; but in this they are grievously in error. One of the greatest speeches ever made in the Constitutional Convention was that one uttered by Patrick Henry in opposition to the Constitution, based upon the theory that it was too hard to amend and that it would be practically impossible to do so. And for more than a hundred years of our history the Constitution has not been amended except by the sword. But the men who made the Constitution themselves gave the people two modes by which they might amend it. They made it hard, exceeding hard, to amend it. For the day in which they lived it met every requirement, but they could not peer through the centuries of the future and see the requirements that advanced

civilization would make necessary. Thomas Jefferson himself used these words:

Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well. I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but lacked the experience of the present—and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading—and this they would say themselves were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate of frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with, because when once known we accommodate ourselves to them and find practical means of correcting their evil effects. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand and hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * We might as well require a man to wear the coat that fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the régime of their ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Their monarchs, instead of wisely yielding to the gradual change of circumstances, of favoring progressive accommodation to progressive improvement, have clung to old abuses, entrenched themselves behind steady habits, and obliged their subjects to seek through blood and violence rash and ruinous innovations, which, had they been referred to the peaceful deliberations and collected wisdom of the nation, would have been put into acceptable and salutary forms. Let us follow no such examples, nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself and of ordering its own affairs. * * * Each generation is as independent of the one preceding as that was of all that had gone before. It has, like them, the right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness; consequently, to accommodate to the circumstances in which it finds itself that received from its predecessors; and it is for the peace and good of mankind that a solemn opportunity of doing this every 10 or 20 years should be provided by the Constitution, so that it may be handed on with periodical repairs from generation to the end of time, if anything human can so long endure.

These words are prophetic; they are almost inspired. They come from the one unmatched champion of the liberty of men, who battled in the twilight of the Republic's existence for the greatest liberty to the people. He has been vindicated by the events that have followed as no statesman who lived before him and, as I believe, by none who will come after him. No one doubts, Mr. Speaker, that if the honest, patriotic men who made the Constitution could have looked down the long vista that has followed them that they would have provided for the election of Senators by the State legislatures. No millionaires lived in that heroic age, no trusts, monopolies, and lawless combinations banded themselves together with bags of gold to control one of the lawmaking branches of this Republic. Bribery and corruption of members of the legislature had not been heard of. It was the purest and best age of our American life. But even then Jefferson thought, and Wilson, of Pennsylvania, thought, that the Members of the Senate should be elected by the direct vote of the people. This amendment, that gives to the people the right to elect their Senators by a direct vote, will make unnecessary, after its adoption, costly investigating committees, holding long-drawn-out sessions at great governmental expense, investigating how many members of the legislature were bribed, or whether a man really confessed he was bribed when he was not. They will no longer have to investigate how great a corruption fund was collected by the trusts and monopolies to control and buy up members of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it will, in my judgment, make unnecessary hereafter the use of so much whitewash in making reports upon bribery charges, and the people may have whitewash for their fences throughout the country in which we live at a reduced price. [Applause.] When the Constitution was formed we had just gained our independence from the mother country. The people were divided between democracy and monarchy. A republic to them was an experiment, never having been blessed by a free government, and many of them yearned for it; others feared it. These two contending forces were represented in the constitutional convention. England had a House of Lords, and that was the idea that actuated those who desired that the Senate should be made up of ambassadors, as some called them, from the various States, and should be as nearly as possible like the House of Lords. Yet England, in the few months recently passed, has been in a terrific political upheaval in order to try to abolish that body, after which this very provision in our Constitution was patterned. [Applause.] The people of the various States—30 of them—have approached as nearly as they could, by primary-election laws, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. The Democratic national platform for many years has urged this great reform and has declared that it is the gateway to all other reforms. [Applause.] And I am delighted now, Mr. Speaker, to know that this reform for which the Democratic Party was the pioneer in its advocacy meets to-day practically the unanimous approval of all Americans.

Who is prepared to say that it was a mistake to lodge in the hands of the people the right to elect Members of Congress. The great reforms that have blessed this country have orig-

inated in this body at the hands of men sent fresh from the people, men who had listened to the heartbeats of those whose votes they asked and received at the polls, those who had been trusted by the people, and who were willing to trust those who had trusted them. [Applause.] This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will reduce to a minimum the opportunity for corruption in the election of Senators to the Senate of the United States. One of the most favored means of corrupting men under the system as it now exists in the election of Senators by the State legislatures is by the candidate for the Senate going into the various counties in a legislative district and saying to John Jones, "You are a candidate for the Democratic nomination," or the Republican nomination, as the case may be; "I want to contribute to your campaign fund to aid you in getting your nomination," and then going to another one in another county and saying the same thing, and thus spreading his money around in the various legislative and senatorial districts under the pretense of aiding the candidate to secure the nomination, when his real purpose was to secure the vote of that candidate in his race for the United States Senate. And when the candidate had been successful and was commissioned by his people as their representative, he felt that he was obliged to vote for the man who had helped him to secure his election. This amendment to the Constitution will give to the poor men of this country a chance to go before the people and submit their claims. It will make hereafter, Mr. Speaker, unnecessary the monotonous reading in the daily newspapers that the legislature of such and such a State cast the eleven thousand nine hundred and ninety-eighth ballot and the result was no election. It will result in sending men fresh from the people, men who truly and really represent them. It will give the people confidence in their Government.

Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this amendment to the Constitution do so because they really believe that a few men are wiser than all the rest. This was the argument upon which thrones were builded and dynasties perpetuated, but it has no place in a Republic like this. [Applause.] That government will live longest which is best loved, and that one will be best loved that gives the greatest liberty to the people. Adopt this amendment; meet the desires of the American people; give the States of the Union an opportunity to make it a part of our Constitution; make the Senate what it ought to be, a body in which the representatives of the people, elected by the people, represent truly the people; and I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, the day is not far distant when the Senators in every State in this Union will be, under this amendment to our Federal Constitution, elected by the direct vote of the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, or 10 if he desires it, to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

[Mr. CLAYTON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution as it is drawn and as it comes from the committee.

When the United States Constitution was formed, democracy itself was on trial. There were not lacking those in the Federal Convention who desired to see a constitutional monarchy or an aristocracy clothed with permanent political power. A leader who has since been adopted as the patron saint of a political party of these days believed in the election of United States Senators for life. Unquestionably out of that conflict of opinion grew the compromise that the choice of Senators should be removed one step from election by the people. It was honestly believed by many that democracy could not secure absolute safety of life and property; but a hundred years of test have proven that democracy is no longer on trial. Democracy has shown that it can secure the safety of life and property; that there is no need for the checks and balances between the will of an intelligent people and the power of those to whom they delegate their political rights. It is not from the people that corruption comes, and that has been the lesson of the century of American history. The man who takes his dinner pail in the morning and leaves his humble home to perform eight hours' honest work in creating the wealth of the Nation; in adding to comfort and civilization; in making the world a better place to live in, and goes back to his home to sleep the sleep of honest toil, is not hanging around the State legislature with a design to corrupt it, to send men to the Senate. [Applause.]

The man who feeds his team before daylight, and at the first streak of dawn is in the field tilling the soil or garnering the golden harvests that shall be sent abroad or bless the homes and fill the dinner pails of countless thousands of his fellow citizens has no time to corrupt the State legislature to send men in his interest to the United States Senate, but these are the men upon whose broad shoulders rests the perpetuity of the Republic. [Applause.] This amendment is designed to place the power of choosing Senators where the right to choose them belongs—in the common, everyday, intelligent, honest, patriotic voters of the country. [Applause.] A hundred years have proven that the corruption incident to free government does not come from the homes of the average voters, but does come from special interests so equipped as to make their influence predominant in the choosing of select bodies. It is to cure that evil that the American people are now demanding the right to the direct election of United States Senators. And now, on this 13th day of April, on the day that over 7,000,000 American freemen are glad to celebrate as the birthday of him whose influence has echoed down through all the corridors of time in the forming of the American Republic; on the natal day of the Sage of Monticello, this House of Representatives can do no better than to perform its part to crystallize into law the will of the American people and the expressed belief of Thomas Jefferson by passing this amendment to the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Pickett].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss that part of the resolution relative to the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. I do not regard that part of the resolution as being in controversy here. There is little, if any, division of opinion in this body on that question. If the resolution was confined to that proposition alone, it would have been passed before this, and this debate would not now be in progress.

The resolution, however, contains another proposition separate and distinct from the proposed change in the method of electing Senators. It is proposed to withdraw from Congress its control over the time and manner of holding elections for United States Senators, as prescribed in paragraph 1, section 4, Article I, of the Constitution.

The framers of our Constitution vested in Congress under said section 4 the power to review and to make or change the regulations of the States with respect to the time and manner of holding elections both for Senators and Representatives in Congress. That this was a proper grant of power seems clear. It can not be urged that thus far in our history it has been improperly used. It is unlikely that it may ever be necessary to use it. On the other hand, some occasion or exigency may arise, which we can not now foresee, when it would be quite necessary for Congress to have such power. The fact that the power exists will have the effect to prevent the occasion for its use. It is now proposed to withdraw that power in so far only as it applies to the election of United States Senators. While I am not familiar with the debates of this body in past years when resolutions relative to changing the method of electing Senators were under consideration, I am informed by those older in the service that the proposition involving the withdrawal from Congress of its power over regulations as to the time and manner of elections for Senators has never been embodied in any of the resolutions heretofore presented, and that the question has never been considered in this House. It is before us for the first time. It involves a change in our fundamental law without any apparent or stated reason for doing so. It is concededly not necessary to give effect to the proposed amendment for the election of Senators by a direct vote. No such contention is even made. In fact, the author of and sponsors for the proposition advance no argument in support of it. I am not prepared at this time to discuss the question either as to the wisdom of the change from a governmental point of view or as to the construction that may be given to it in the form in which it is presented, with the care and preparation which a question of so much importance demands.

Serious controversy has already arisen as to its effect. On the one side it is urged that it will withdraw from Congress the control granted under section 4 of Article I, both as to Senators and Representatives. On the other side it is claimed that it applies only to Senators. It is to be regretted that the propositions are not presented in separate resolutions, as they ought to be. The people have a right to pass on these questions separately. Why encumber the proposition to change the method of electing Senators by another proposition, separate and distinct

from it and on which there is already serious controversy and the effect of which on the general resolution we can not foresee?

When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. James], a few moments ago, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon], was urging that the amendment would only apply to the power of Congress over election of Senators and not as to Representatives, it occurred to me to be a most peculiar and anomalous position to say that Congress, composed of both Senate and House—one legislative body—should have control over the election of the Members of one of its branches and not of the other. If the power should exist as to one, why not as to the other? If the grant of power is proper in one case, why not in the other case? The analogy is complete. The principle is the same. There is and can be no distinction.

The gentleman from Kentucky, turning to this side of the House, expressed regret that we should raise this question, and charged that we were trying to bring up and revive sectional differences. I want to say to the gentleman that we have not revived that issue. You yourselves have presented the issue. The resolutions heretofore presented to this House for submission to the people of an amendment to the Constitution providing for election of Senators by direct vote did not contain the further proposition now presented, and when the committee composed of and controlled by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle brought in the resolution before us containing for the first time in this body the proposition in controversy, they themselves raised the question and are responsible for it.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, composed of a majority of Republicans, reported this identical amendment in the very language we propose it, and that the author of it was Senator BORAH, a Republican?

Mr. PICKETT. It has been stated a dozen times during this debate that such is the fact.

Mr. JAMES. Then why does the gentleman say that we brought up and precipitated the issue? Why do you not put it on your own party?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. PICKETT. There is no point in the observation of the gentleman from Kentucky. I was referring to the history of the proceedings in this House. He pointed his finger over here and observed that we had raised this question. I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that your committee raised this question so far as this House is concerned.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman from Iowa dodges the issue. One of his own party raised the issue in the Senate report.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield unless the gentleman from Kentucky wishes to ask a question. This side of the House is not responsible for what any Senator may or may not do or for what any committee of the Senate may or may not do. This House is governed by its own precedents, its own acts. I was speaking of this body and not of another body; but I will say that if we are to look for precedents, as the gentleman insists, then we should take the action of the Senate when it struck from the resolution the part now in controversy and left the resolution as a simple and direct proposition to amend the Constitution with respect to the method of electing United States Senators.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PICKETT. I will.

Mr. COOPER. I heard the gentleman say that Congress retained the power by virtue of the Constitution as to the time and place and manner of electing Representatives in Congress. I would like to ask what section that is.

Mr. PICKETT. Paragraph 1, section 4, of Article I of the Constitution. In conclusion, I wish to emphasize the importance of due deliberation in passing on a question of so much importance as the withdrawal from Congress of its power over the election of its own Members, and I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] to the resolution may prevail. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time has been consumed on the one side and on the other?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 hour and 5 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Missouri 46 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no question of the wisdom of the fathers in making the provision they did in regard to the election of United States Senators. They had not learned, as we have learned, how dependable and safe is an educated democracy. Furthermore, they did not have in those days the widespread opportunities of education, the high average of intelligence, and the widely diffused knowledge of governmental affairs that the people have at this time. Furthermore, times have changed, and conditions confronting and surrounding us are vastly different from what they were at the time the Constitution was adopted.

The people generally throughout the country have come to the conclusion that it is better to elect Senators by direct vote. So widespread is this feeling that in at least 27 States provisions have been made intending, so far as it is possible to do so under the Constitution, to provide for a direct expression of the people in the election of Senators. Even though I did not believe, as I do believe, that the Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people, I should believe it and hold it my duty to vote for a resolution to give the people of the States an opportunity to express their opinion on that question; but, Mr. Speaker, we are unfortunate in the form of the resolution now before us. It is, in my opinion, faulty in two essential respects. The demand has been for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people.

The resolution before us does not contain a provision specifically providing for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people, and I am not certain that the courts might not hold that the language used in the resolution would authorize the election of Senators through some intermediary body. Second, there has been interjected into this resolution a provision amending section 4 of Article I, entirely foreign to the question which has been so widely agitated among the people, taking from the Congress of the United States supervision and control over the election of Senators, and probably over the election of Representatives in Congress. There has been no demand at any time among the people of the country for a constitutional change of this character. No party platform has ever demanded it, and, in my opinion, it is not desired by the people. In order to meet these objections I shall offer in my time a substitute for the resolution now before the House, said substitute being in the form of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress and reported to the House. That resolution provides clearly and specifically for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. That resolution does not relate or refer to section 4 of Article I, and it presents in a concrete form and in simple language for the consideration of the people of the country the great question which has been so widely discussed for such a length of time, to wit, Shall Senators of the United States be elected by a direct vote of the people?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. POWERS. Section 4 of Article I of the Constitution now provides that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. POWERS. I had not completed my question.

Mr. MONDELL. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. POWERS. I would like to know in what instance Congress has ever felt it necessary to interfere with the time, manner, and so forth, of holding elections as prescribed by the Constitution?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it does not occur to me that it is important to inquire whether Congress has ever thought it necessary to exercise this authority, though, in fact, it has done so. The important thing about it is that it is a part of the fundamental law of the land. There has been no general demand for its repeal or its amendment. There has been no debate anywhere or discussion by the people in favor of a change or amendment to that provision of the Constitution. The time may come when it is of the utmost importance that Congress shall exercise this power, and certainly the majority,

if it is acting in good faith, ought not, in presenting this proposition on which we are generally agreed, insist on coupling it with another and entirely different matter, in regard to which there is a wide difference of opinion. I shall vote for the substitute I have offered; if that is defeated, I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young]; and if that is defeated, I shall vote for the resolution; not that I think it should pass in that form, but because I expect it to be amended in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute this resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. JAMES (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that if the amendment is to be read it must be read in the time of the gentleman who offered it, or in the time of that side of the House.

The SPEAKER. It is being read in that time.

Mr. JAMES. I thought the time of the gentleman had expired?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman had expired, but the gentleman had the resolution in his hand ready to send to the Clerk's desk, and I thought it was only fair to have it read.

Mr. JAMES. I agree with the Chair that it is fair; but it is equally fair that it should be taken out of somebody's time.

The SPEAKER. It will be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. If the gentleman insists, I will yield more time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the reading of the substitute, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America, the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:

"Sec. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate, the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph 1: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State.

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall].

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, it is no light thing to amend the Constitution of the United States. That is legislative work which no body of men is capable of performing offhand. I do not think that we should try to improvise substitutes for the different articles now contained in our organic law. Gentlemen will remember the amendment that was hastily put through the two Houses of Congress less than two years ago to impose an income tax, and there is one thing about that amendment, about its form, that has given better ground for opposition than everything pertaining to its substance, and that is that the amendment was so sweeping in character that it gave to the Federal Government in terms the power to tax the incomes derived from State bonds and from municipal bonds and from the other instrumentalities of local government, and, as we know, it has been held that the power to tax is the power to destroy, we conferred by that amendment in terms the power to the National Government to wipe out of existence any local government of the country. I regret, therefore, that this amendment should not have been more carefully considered and that there should not have been time given to the Members of the House to read the report and to study the form in which it is presented and to determine whether they should vote for it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any objection to having the people of the different States elect their representatives in the Senate precisely in the same way as they elect their governors or as they elect their Members of this House. I am in favor of that proposition, notwithstanding the fact that the old system has generally worked well, and notwithstanding that the application of the new system in some States has not invariably worked well. For years the legislatures performed their functions a good deal in the way it was intended the electors for President should perform their functions, and they

sent a fine body of men to the United States Senate; but, under the pressure of modern conditions, after men had accumulated great wealth, a new era was brought in and the system did not work uniformly so well. We elect a legislature; that legislature is chosen for the purpose of enacting laws to govern the State.

It is not chosen primarily for the purpose of electing the men to represent the State in the Senate, and the result is that the members of that legislature are turned over to intrigue and earboring, and nobody knows what other arts in order to influence their judgment. I believe it would be more open, it would be better, that we should have better popular government if the people should vote directly for their Senators. Now, that that system has not worked well in some of the States, in my opinion, is due to the conditions of some of the States' primary laws. State primary laws may be good things, but a State primary law that permits the members of one party to enter the caucus of the other party and dictate its nominees is nothing but a low swindle upon representative party government. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one part of this proposed amendment that I very much object to, and I object to it so strongly that I shall vote against the whole proposition if it remains in the resolution. It is proposed to take from the National Government the supervisory power that the framers of the Constitution put there and that it should have. No matter if it has been a sleeping power up to this time, it may sometime be a power that is vital to the preservation almost of the Republic. It proposes to take away from the National Government the supervisory power that it has over the electing of the members of the great political department of the Government. You destroy the symmetry of the instrument by permitting that, and providing, or permitting it may provide, that these regulations concerning the Members of this House—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will have to content myself.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will use some of his time now.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has more time than I have.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Then I will yield—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the argument of the gifted gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STANLEY. Although I do not entirely agree with him, I will yield him two minutes of the time that has been allotted to me. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding to me and for the kindly terms in which he has done so. I had about finished my argument, and I do not think that I care to resume it now. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, but will return the time to him.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as has been said repeatedly, this has not been and is not now a partisan question. I do not think there is much diversity of opinion to be found in the membership of this House upon the general proposition of electing United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. I do think, however, that there has been injected into this general discussion a feature that might properly be considered more at length than the one on which we are practically agreed. I refer, of course, to that paragraph which purports to assign and give to the States the absolute power to decide the time, manner, and place for the selection of United States Senators. It seems to me, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], that one great branch of the Government is hereby surrendering its power to perpetuate and maintain itself. It is giving to the States a right which the symmetry of the Constitution, which our scheme of government, nationally conceived, requires should rest with the Federal power.

The proponents of this feature of the resolution have overlooked the great necessity our Government is under to protect and maintain the respective sovereignties of State and Nation. As all the world knows, the great principles contained in our Constitution were not the invention of the framers of that document, but the result of centuries of political evolution on the part of the Anglo-Saxon race. That feature which is perhaps most original is the division of sovereignty between State and Nation. The distribution of sovereignty, agreed upon in the constitutional convention, has been materially changed during the decades that have passed, due to the unfolding of political and economic forces.

It is natural that both the States and the Federal Government should be jealous of their rights, and each particularly jealous of any encroachment of power on the part of the other. The very system of our Government, and therefore the perpetuity of our institutions, depend upon the proper distribution of sovereign power between State and nation. By this section of the proposed amendment the Federal Government places the control and perpetuity of an important element of its sovereignty in the possession of the States. If States have exclusive control of the time, manner, and place of electing United States Senators they can, if it pleases them to usurp the function, control the most important part of the legislative branch of the Government. By refusing to elect at all, the legislative arm of the Federal Government would be paralyzed. Many men now live who witnessed almost one-half of the States withdraw from the Union and refuse to send Members to Congress. That which happened once may happen again, and under such conditions the Federal Government should be able to exercise supreme control over the election of those who are to exercise Federal legislative power.

If, perchance, State legislatures should give to Congress the right to select members of the State legislatures, to prescribe the time, manner, and place, how ridiculous it would be. Equally ridiculous is it for the National Government thus to surrender its power.

We are frankly told by gentlemen from the other side of the Chamber that the main purpose of this section is to prevent, on the part of the Federal Government, interference with disfranchisement of the negro, now practically complete, in all the Southern States. Such a statement condemns the section and gives emphatic reason why it should not become a part of the Constitution. If this passes, we have a Constitution presenting the ridiculous spectacle of guaranteeing the right of franchise to the negro in one section and effectually taking it away in another. But apart from this inconsistency and incongruity, I do not believe we should indorse or permit any act looking to the disfranchisement of this great multitude that is making such great progress in political ability and industrial life.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose any academic discussion can or will change a vote on this question. The majority are for this section, and they do not propose to give us an opportunity to eliminate it. Indulgent they permit us to talk about it for a little time, but amend it—never! A few days ago, at the beginning of this Congress, we were led to believe the halcyon days had come. Then the leaders on that side, with words that fell with sweet cadence upon our ears, promised that during this Congress full freedom of debate should be extended and every opportunity for amendment granted. Here we have the measure of their performance. A proposition as important as any that will come before this Congress is suddenly thrust upon us, no opportunity given to investigate or consider the far-reaching effect of its imperfectly understood provisions, and we are told to swallow it whole, instantly, keeping from choking if we can.

While I am reluctant to vote for that feature of the resolution I have just mentioned, the importance of the resolution as a whole is so great that I am heartily in its support. This proposed amendment to the Constitution illustrates and effectuates political evolution in the United States. The wisdom of the fathers has often been commented upon because they gave to the country a great Constitution. This credit is their due. They were somewhat skeptical of the ability of the general mass of people to act intelligently and patriotically in things political, but this was due largely to the fact that Anglo-Saxon democracy had not been given a trial and historical precedent was lacking. But political evolution in this country has corrected the errors, in this regard, committed by the fathers. They thought the average man could not vote intelligently for President, so they introduced the college of electors. But for many decades the electoral college has been a pure fiction, and in effect each citizen now votes directly for President. Those fathers also thought it wise to take the selecting of Senators from the people and place that power in the hands of the legislatures of the several States. In recent years we find the legislatures of many States bound by law to carry out the will of the people as expressed in a primary election to choose a United States Senator. This evolution indicates that all political power belongs to the people; that our people can exercise it; and, what is more, propose to exercise it. You can no more change this great law of political evolution than you can change a law of nature.

This evolution of 130 years has shown that the power of election of all representatives of the people in each and every department of the Government should remain with the people who are to be served. If they make a mistake, the mistake is theirs, and they have a right to make it. The election by direct

vote of the people tends to effectuate what we may term a pure republican form of government of the representative character conceived many hundred years ago and first brought forth and perfected on the American continent.

I hope that we will pass this by as large and nearly a unanimous vote as possible, to show to the country that the Members of this body on each side of the aisle are advocates of a progressive political theory that shall preserve and keep to the people, where it belongs, every fundamental power of a political nature. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate but two objections have been suggested to the passage of this resolution. The first is a puny plea in abatement. It is claimed by some gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that there is an undue haste in presenting and considering this measure.

The answer to that statement is found in the fact that every Member of this body understands fully the provision now under consideration. It was thoroughly threshed out and discussed by the Judiciary Committee of the body at the other end of the Capitol, and discussed at great length in that body. Every Member here understands its true import, and there is no necessity or excuse for delay.

I must confess, gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, that it is somewhat gratifying to me to know that the chairman of this committee and the committee having this joint resolution in charge have so promptly and so speedily responded to the demand of the public, which the Republican Party has been dilatory in responding to and has refused to recognize for many years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The other objection urged to this measure on that side by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] and the gentleman from Illinois, the ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. CANNON], namely, that the Federal Government in the adoption of the amendment now proposed is abrogating the power of self-perpetuation and encouraging a spirit of secession, is equally unfounded. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois, in his efforts to maintain the power of State legislatures to elect Members of the United States Senate, recalls the fact that every State that ever attempted to go out of the Union did so through the passage of an ordinance of secession by its legislature?

Each House will still be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own Members if this amendment is finally ratified. That provision of the Constitution is not affected directly by this joint resolution. The manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives can not fairly be said to involve the perpetuity of the Federal Government, nor can any action of the States in that regard diminish the fundamental powers delegated in the Constitution to the Federal Government. This objection seems to be far-fetched, and from a practical standpoint is of no great importance. If the people of the various States are to exercise the power of electing their Senators, no reason appears why the Congress should reserve the right to make or alter the regulations prescribed by the people themselves for the exercise of that power. The power of Congress to make or alter regulations by the States for the election of Members of Congress, if sought to be eliminated by the proposed amendment, has never appeared to be necessary for the preservation of the National Government nor indispensable to the exercise of its powers. "Force" bills, Federal election laws, in the light of history, have contributed nothing of value to the administration of the Government and have always proved distasteful. If the people can be trusted to elect their Senators by popular vote, as appears to be the consensus of opinion, it would seem not improper to provide that they may determine the manner of the election.

I want to suggest to gentlemen that the day for "force" bills has passed; that there is in no part of this Republic the possibility of the development of any spirit of secession; that issue has long been settled. For the sake of consistency it is well to write into the Constitution with respect to the election of Senators a provision similar to that which exists concerning the election of the President of the United States. The Constitution gives to the legislatures of the States the power to fix the manner of selecting presidential electors, and the only limitation upon that power is that—

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress—

And so forth.

You can trust the people to elect a President. Every one concedes the fact that the election of presidential electors is practically an election of the President by the people. Do you want to deny to the people of the States full power to choose their Senators?

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I believe that this resolution ought to be adopted for four general reasons.

First. It will increase the power of the people. This, to me, is of primary and paramount importance. If any reason ever existed for requiring that United States Senators be elected by legislatures and not by popular vote that reason has long since disappeared. If our political history demonstrates one fact more clearly than any other, it is the conclusion that abuses are more certainly averted and good government more surely promoted by the recognition in practice of the principle that the people are the source of all political power and may be trusted to exercise it.

Second. The adoption of this resolution, and the consequent election of United States Senators by popular vote, will make the legislative branch of the Government, including the body at the other end of the Capitol, fairly responsive to the public will. When any question of legislative policy has been agitated and the voters of a State have reached a conclusion and expressed that conclusion it will no longer be difficult or impossible to induce Members of the body at the other end of this Capitol to yield to the public demand for reforms in legislation.

Third. The deadlocks which have so often occurred during recent years in the selection of United States Senators, and the consequent detriment to the public, can not happen if this resolution is passed and ratified by the States. I need not recount the many instances that emphasize the importance of this suggestion. That a State may be denied representation in the Senate by reason of the failure of its legislature to elect a Senator has long discredited the prevailing system of electing Senators.

Fourth. The shameful and disgraceful practices occurring in some of the State legislatures in the selection of United States Senators will be terminated if the power to choose Senators is exercised directly by the voters. That bribery and various forms of corruption should have become frequent, not to say common, in the present method of electing Senators is of itself sufficient to discredit the prevailing method and to encourage us to seek and adopt a system which, it is hoped, will be free from such abuses.

The time has come when this amendment will receive the hearty approval of nearly all the States. It will not, of course, relieve the election of Senators from all corrupt influences, but it will place it directly in the power of the voters to choose Senators who are in accord with the spirit of the times and who will give emphasis to the recognized and enlightened view of the voters.

The day of "government by superior people" has passed. Every public citizen will still have and exercise the power of asserting his views and of seeking to mold sentiment on political questions. The passage of this amendment will no more deprive Senators of the privilege of leading in reforms or of opposing improvident and ill-considered measures than does the election of Congressmen deprive Members of this body of that right and power. It will, however, diminish obstinacy and prevent the obstruction of needed legislation, and thus bring the Senate closer to the people.

If the voters are to have the power of governing the country, if legislative policies are to be fixed by an enlightened public opinion and not by selfish interests, it is necessary that both branches of Congress be fairly responsive to the public will and directly responsible to the people. The passage of legislation, however much desired by one body, results in nothing if defeated in the other. This frequently occurs now, but it will not happen so often if this amendment is ratified.

In this great Republic, employing many thousands of persons, Members of this body, the Members of the House of Representatives, are the only elective officers. In the course of progress the people of the United States have reached the conclusion that Members of the other legislative body ought also to be elected.

I, for one, am in favor of giving the people that power, and in favor of giving them the power without reservation, because they can exercise it much more skillfully and much better for the Government than it is now exercised. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, stripped of all its verbiage and all its frills this joint resolution amending the United States Constitution, as we are all aware, allows the people to elect their Senators by the popular vote rather than have the various legislatures select them. No gentleman on the opposite side, and no one disposed to oppose this measure, has said that it would not accomplish that purpose. Until such a charge is made we must assume that the opposition is but fanciful rather than real. The opponents of this reform have objected to this particular verbiage and to that, but no opponent of the measure and no one who has even partially favored it has said that it would not accomplish election of Senators by the people. The venerable ex-Speaker CANNON, who announced that he would not support this resolution, did not say it would not accomplish the purpose, but he objected to something relative to the particular language used. I for one am heartily in favor of this resolution as it stands, because it accomplishes what 90 per cent, nay, I believe, 99 per cent, of the people desire. I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the committee itself that they have caused this to be the first bill reported by a Democratic committee. I will wait until the adjournment to-day to congratulate this Democratic House on this being the first bill that it passed. I think it is a beautiful tribute to the House of Representatives, I think it is a beautiful tribute to the American people, I believe it is a beautiful compliment to the Democratic Party to pass as their first bill a bill so universally desired. [Applause.]

My friends, in looking over the report I am sorry to find a minority report signed by a Republican Member of this House from the thirty-second district of New York. I am sorry that he assigns only the insufficient reason, which in substance is that he is opposed to it fundamentally. I can not consistently attribute that same view to all of the minority of this House, because many of them have asserted their fealty and their willingness to support it; but I can not but pause for a moment to suggest that it is but a continuation of their 16 years of dilatory tactics in refusing to give this legislation to the American people. I can not but call attention to the fact that for 16 long years the Republican Party have been in full control of both the House, the Senate, and the Chief Executive, and through all those years, with full power invested in them, they have refused to enact it into law. Each of them on the stump and each of them in person can assign reasons, but to the absolute failure to act there can be no valid reason that the people will accept. Men are known better by what they do than by what they say. Political parties are likewise known better by what they do than by what they say. And I might be severe enough to suggest that men sometimes walk one way and look the other. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They sometimes assert they are in favor of the principle involved, but are always found opposing, by reason of some minor detail unworthy and insufficient, to defeat a great principle. And when we observe the bickerings and parliamentary tactics of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber we can not but think this is such a case.

The question of right to select Senators by a popular vote is not a new one. Strong men advocate that they be so elected in the Constitutional Convention of 1789. At that time such a group of States as this was not dreamed of, and no one with the most exuberant expectations could have dreamed that such ever would be the case. In 1789 a handful of poor, struggling settlers, to-day a Republic of whom the whole world points with pride and esteem. To-day 92,000,000 of liberty-loving American citizens asking for this right. To-day I am proud to find a Democratic House, charged with power to act for the people and in their interests, passing this as their first bill.

We stand before the people at election time and solicit their support and at the same time their confidence. We are elected only after both have been acquired. Then, why should not it be a matter indeed refreshing to find a Congress willing to do the things that they promised the people they would do? For 16 long years the Republicans have trifled with the people's confidence and esteem. For 16 years, with full power to act, they have swept aside the people's wishes as heresies and vagaries, until to-day the party of Lincoln and McKinley has become a by-word in the streets, and their retirement at the recent election is but evidence that the people longer refuse to be trifled with.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] complains of corrupt States and the evil effects that would follow if this bill passed in its present form. Can it be that any State in all this Republic is more corrupt than the legislature elected by a corrupt State? Is he not mistaken in his premises when he predicates an argument on so flimsy a foundation? Is he even misleading himself with any argument so flimsy and so unfounded? Corruption is found less often among American

homes than it is around legislatures, and none can gainsay the truth of this assertion.

Recent disclosures in the legislatures have been appalling to us all. Recent disclosures have not alone blighted the names of the corrupt participants, but have reached out and blasted the fair names of whole States in which they conduct their nefarious deals, made possible only by a system so antiquated and so unworthy as the election of Senators by the legislatures of the States as distinguished by the patriotic people of the several States.

I can never think this Republic will long stand after we fail to trust the people who pay the taxes in time of peace and shoulder their muskets in time of pestilence and war. I can never think it less safe to trust all the people of any State than it is to trust a few of the same people of the same State. I shall never subscribe to such a theory, in office or out. I shall never be a party to any dilatory tactics practiced by the Republicans in this House to delay action on a question so fundamentally correct. I shall never quibble over details when the accomplishment of a great principle is at stake.

The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared for this principle in convention assembled, and each platform since my early youth has borne pledges to the people of its enactment into law.

I rejoice and rejoice thrice and thrice again that this Congress during the very first days of its interesting session is going to make this much-needed reform a reality. It is but the keeping of faith with the people, and they are entitled to it. It will purify elections. It will bring wholesome results to State and Nation. There are other features of legislation that we have promised the people, and they will follow. It may be asserted that it will fail in the Republican Senate, and it may; but behind it all the people will know who their friends are, and will also know where the trouble has been these long years. It is my belief, if the Senators were elected by the people so that at each returning campaign the candidates for Senator would have to return to their people and get the indorsement and acquaintance of their people, there would be less unwillingness to enact laws that all of the people want. Close contact with the people can only be acquired by forcing the candidate to consult them. Close acquaintance can not be exacted unless the power is vested in the people to punish or reward. When the power is vested in the legislatures of the States, the candidate does not have to proceed further than to acquaint himself with the few members of the legislature to further hold his seat, and the people receive little or, at least, inferior consideration from him. I rejoice to see the people coming into their own, and they are eminently entitled to it. It is not more than they should ask. It is but common justice. It will result in nought but good.

It is charged by opponents of the measure that it is revolutionary and socialistic. I deny it, and it is not borne out by the facts. It is common justice and common sense. It is but the doing of exact justice to a people who have long been denied that right to select their Members of Congress in both branches.

Since I came to Congress I have each session introduced a joint resolution for the election of Senators by the popular vote. I have a bill pending now, and if this bill fails in a Republican Senate, I shall reintroduce each session as long as I am here, and at each occasion, like "Banquo's ghost," I will appear on the scene until it becomes the law of the land and a part of the American Constitution.

The American people have said you shall not barter away their rights by men they did not elect, and you shall not defeat this legislation without the protest and the knowledge of the people who are wronged by the defeat.

It is charged that none but the rich can afford to run for the Senate if popular election is exacted of them by the people. It is not so. Senators are elected for six years, three times the length of the time for which the House Members are chosen, and there is no occasion for the application of such a rule or such a statement. Again it may be said that it is of equal importance that Senators be as near to the people as the more numerous branch of Congress, for each bill and each resolution has to pass both bodies before it becomes a law. I submit for one branch to be responsive and the other inactive and irresponsible to the will of the people is almost as deplorable as if both branches were selected otherwise than by the people.

Power begets respect. The absence of power without exception makes respect at best more tardy and usually totally absent. The people should have the power in the abstract, but surely they should have it when it begets for them the respect the Constitution intended them to have.

Pass this joint resolution and you make no mistake. Pass the resolution and the States will act at their first sitting.

Pass this resolution and the American people will see we intend to keep the faith when in power that we advocated when not in power. Pass this resolution and make responsive that body which is too far removed from the aches and pains of the people. Pass it and endear yourselves to the people of all political faiths and enact a reform from which no ill effects can emanate. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I should like to have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman allow me to make a statement?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state that at this time I will not object, but I put the House on notice that hereafter no speeches not delivered and no extension of remarks will be printed in the Record in the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Florida if this rule is to be applied to everyone hereafter?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman from Florida proposes to object to all requests hereafter.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. After to-day; yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will begin now. I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this question is important and a great many gentlemen on both sides, I am informed, desire to express their views briefly who will not have a chance to consume time on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of this House, whether they have been recognized or not, who desire to express their views on this great question may be permitted to do so within five legislative days, their remarks to be confined to the subject matter of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all Members desiring to print remarks in the Record on this question may have five legislative days in which to do so. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope no gentleman will object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that his request be modified by the statement that the Record shall show that the speech is printed under leave.

Mr. KENDALL. I hope the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that there has been an abuse in the past in regard to leave-to-print speeches in the Record. Now, it is manifest that we must either have much more discussion, or else relief must be given through leave to print in the Record; but it seems to me proper that there should be something in the Record to indicate that the speech is printed under leave.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, let me say, I believe it would be well to enforce the rule with rigor as applicable to mere political essays written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but this is not that. But it is not that. This is a great question, not partisan, and it affects all people alike. It has its ardent advocates on one side of the Chamber as well as the other. I do not believe anybody in reference to this particular question ought to have the rule enforced against it.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I shall insist that the speeches shall be germane to the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That was my request, and I so stated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have made every effort possible to get sufficient time for actual discussion upon the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Now, is it the purpose to insert a lot of speeches in the Record to make it appear that we had full discussion on the subject?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not forgotten that, standing quite close to him and making some demonstration, I asked if they wanted two hours or four hours or a day for general debate on that side.

Mr. MANN. Four hours is a day, and we took all the time we could get.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am speaking of a day from the standpoint of 12 hours.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but the gentleman said that he proposed to close general debate and pass this bill to-day.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen will bear me witness that I said we were going to pass the bill to-day, and I should ask for the previous question if we could not agree on a time for general debate.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am not going to object, and I will withdraw the objection that I heretofore made, because I think it will look better for us even if we fake in the Record an apparent consideration of an amendment to the Constitution which was actually refused in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to what has been denominated fake speeches, I desire to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri to amend his request for unanimous consent to this effect—that the time for this debate be extended one hour on each side, and if at the expiration of that time all gentlemen have not been heard on this side or that, the request can be renewed. On this side gentlemen are only taking five minutes. That is as much time as I desire to have, and I do not desire to put any fake speech in the Record.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the time was agreed upon for general debate at the suggestion, as I understood it, of the gentleman from Michigan. Now, I say to him that if he desires to extend the debate for one hour or two hours, if he will indicate it, I will ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I should be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to agree with the gentleman to extend the time of debate two hours, if satisfactory to him and the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Two hours on each side?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. One hour on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Let me understand, there is a good deal of confusion. I ask the gentleman from Michigan how much time does he ask to extend general debate?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. In view of the general demand for debate about me, I will ask for two hours on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on this resolution be extended two hours on each side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all Members have the privilege of printing speeches in the Record on this proposed amendment for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri what is the objection to the suggestion advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky designating the fact in the speech that it was not delivered, but inserted in the Record by leave?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever, but I understood from audible utterances all around me that there was objection.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that I do not believe it is a proper thing to inject that sort of system in the Record at this time.

Mr. KENDALL. Does the gentleman think it is a proper thing to inject a speech in the Record without having made it on the floor?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. If it is proposed to put that statement in the Record I shall object myself.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pending this matter, objection having been made to extending the general debate for two hours on a side, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri to ask unanimous consent to extend the debate one hour on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend general debate one hour on each side, the time to be divided equally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend general debate one hour on each side, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and the other by the gentleman from Michigan. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request that all gentlemen have five legislative days in which to print remarks on this proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that five legislative days be allowed in which Members may print remarks in the Record upon this proposed amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not at this time object, because it has been a custom long indulged in, but I think the House can well afford to make the Record a real journal of the proceedings here, and I shall undertake in some proper way to have such a rule adopted.

It is proper that men who do not have an opportunity to express their views on the floor should have a medium of presenting them to the country, but it is not proper that they should be presented under false pretenses. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the amendment to elect the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and I am heartily in favor of another amendment which I believe is just as important, and perhaps more important, at least of as much importance, as the election of the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and for that reason I ask in my time to present the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

That there be, and there is hereby, proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become and be effective as part of the Constitution, as follows:

"SEC. 1. Members and Delegates to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall be elected, after the passage of this bill, for a term of four years.

"SEC. 2. Said election shall take place at the time and on the day prescribed by law for the casting of the popular vote for President of the United States, and in the manner prescribed by law by the different States and Territories."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce this because I think it is as important as a direct vote for United States Senators. I believe that the fewer elections we have for Congressmen the better for all concerned. You can not sit in Congress and every two years run for office and do justice to the people who send you here. The fact of the matter is, you are in politics all of the time, and you do not have time enough to do justice in two-year terms. For that reason I offer this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, it must be very apparent to gentlemen on the other side of the House by this time that a great many Members who are sincerely in favor of the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people have some objection to the resolution in the form in which it is presented. If you gentlemen on the other side of the House are earnestly, honestly, and sincerely in favor of bringing about this great reform, to wit, the election of the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, it behooves you to assert your independence upon the roll call upon the issue that is now presented, and send this resolution to the legislatures of the several States in such form that it will be adopted. It is plain to everyone that a great majority of the Members in this House favor the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. We all know that a great majority of the citizens of this country are in favor of that reform, and would so express themselves if they had an opportunity to vote upon it, but I do not believe that a majority of the people of the United States would vote for the Federal Congress to surrender absolutely the power that it now has and has always maintained, to prescribe, if needs be, how Members of the lower and upper Houses of Congress should be elected.

I come from the State of Oregon, a State that stands out preeminently in favor of the direct election of the Senators. In fact, we are so strongly impressed with this belief and so strongly in favor of this reform that we have adopted in our State a direct primary, whereby we have provided that each party shall nominate a candidate for United States Senator at the primary, and that the candidate so nominated shall be placed upon the ballot at the general election and voted for by the people.

The primary law of Oregon further provides that candidates for the legislature may, if they choose, subscribe to either statement No. 1 or statement No. 2, statement No. 1 being that the candidate pledges himself to the people of his district and the people of his State that if elected he will always vote in the election for Senator for that candidate who shall have received the highest number of the people's votes at the last preceding election. It has come to pass, after six years of trial of that system, that no man can be elected to the legislature who does not sign statement No. 1.

Therefore I am not only personally favorable to this resolution, which has been under the peculiar circumstances presented by a Democratic House, but my constituents are in favor of it.

I want to see it become a part of the Constitution of the United States. I am not here playing politics upon the Republican side of this Hall. I am here acting independently. I am here, as some have said, as an insurgent Republican. I am against machine rule. [Applause.] I shall vote for every proposed law that I believe ought to be passed during my service here, whether it comes from a Democratic or a Republican source. The Oregon system of electing all officers by the people and nominating all candidates for office by the people breeds independence, and it breeds insurgents. The reason why the people of the United States want the direct election of Senators is that it makes United States Senators accountable directly to the public for their election, the same as Representatives here are accountable to the public for their election. When the time comes that Senators are elected by the people, the people will get the legislation that they are entitled to, that they are demanding; and if you gentlemen over there want the legislatures of the several States to approve this amendment, then vote to cut out this part of your proposed amendment which takes away from the Federal Government the power of supervision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss the main proposition involved in this resolution, because I hope and believe it will receive the unanimous vote of this House. [Applause.] I do wish to discuss for a moment, however, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]. The resolution as reported from the committee deprives the Federal Government of any power to regulate the time and manner of holding elections. It does more than that. Through the insertion of a word of two letters, the word "as," it also changes the present Constitution, so that there is no duty laid upon any State to prescribe the time and manner of holding elections. Under the Constitution as it exists to-day it provides that the legislature shall prescribe the time and manner and places of holding elections, and also reserves to the Federal Government the power to alter and amend such regulations. This amendment, however, as reported from the committee, contains this language: "The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be," not prescribed, but "as prescribed," therefore imposing no duty upon the legislature to prescribe the time and manner at all. Now, I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan for this reason: The right to elect Senators by the people will be of little value to any State unless there shall also accompany that the right to nominate the men who are voted for at the polls. There are many States in this Union to-day—I need not undertake to mention them—where this amendment to the Constitution will be of little value, because special interests will nominate in both political parties the candidates for the United States Senate, and the people will be compelled to choose between two, neither of whom will be representative of them. If this right was reserved to control the elections by the Federal Government, if this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan shall be adopted, that right can be guaranteed to the people of every State—the right to nominate as well as elect.

It would be entirely practicable and feasible for this Congress to pass a primary law providing for the nomination of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives providing that that law shall be operative only in States where direct nominations have not been provided for by their State legislatures, and, further, that it shall cease to be operative whenever any State by its legislature provides for the direct nomination of these officials. But under this resolution as it comes from the committee and as you propose to adopt it to-day it will be absolutely impossible for the Federal Government or this Congress to ever pass such a law in the future, and is there any gentleman upon that side of the House who would not be in favor of that kind of a law, who would not be in favor of direct nomination of Senators and Representatives in Congress as well as their election; and yet you are deliberately depriving the Congress of the power to secure to the people that right of directly nominating as well as directly electing. I understand, of course, the fear upon the part of the gentlemen upon that side of the House of the Federal Government controlling the elections in certain portions of our country, perhaps interfering with the legislative restrictions that would be cast around the ballot, but I wish to remind you that that is fully safeguarded in the resolution as it comes from your committee and is not touched in any way by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan. The resolution provides that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite

for electors in the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and that will remain as it is, and if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is adopted Congress will have no power to change in any way these State laws with reference to who shall be entitled to vote for United States Senators.

Are you asking anything more than that, and are you afraid of anything else than that? I believe that if this committee that has reported this bill had considered the matter fully, and especially had considered the suggestion that I make as to the nomination of Senators by the different political parties, as well as their election, they, too, and this House, would have been in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I think the time has come when the Senators should be as responsive to the public will as the Members of the House are. The people of the United States justly believe that the Senators are not now responsive to the public will. The resolution, as reported from the committee over which the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] presides, is not complete, and I regret very much to discover in the reading of it that it excludes the Congress of the United States from the privilege of regulating the method of electing United States Senators. It seems to me that the Congress should retain the power to regulate the election of the men to this office. It should control the power to perpetuate itself. It should not leave to the States the right to make such laws as they choose on a question that involves the integrity of the country. States may have different interests than the country may have as a whole, and the Congress should always be in control. I regret that we are not to be able to vote for a bill which gives that right to the Congress.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. As I understand the gentleman, he is in favor of the resolution but opposed to that feature of it which takes away from Congress the power to regulate.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. This Constitution has been in operation for more than a century. Has the Federal Government ever attempted to control or regulate the election of Senators by reason of that power?

Mr. MADDEN. That is no reason, however, why the Government should have the power to control taken away from it, and the very fact that it has not exercised it should not be a reason why it should not have the power to exercise it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does not the gentleman believe that, in view of what we know, historically at least—and none of us know anything about it personally—and what we know of the methods by which Senators are sometimes elected, and of deadlocks existing all over the country, and that the Federal Government has not in a hundred years exercised its powers, it is about time the people should begin to exercise it?

Mr. MADDEN. I believe the people should exercise the power. I believe that delegating to the people the power to elect Senators in Congress would prevent deadlocks. I believe the power should be taken away from the legislatures to elect Senators. The people are best qualified to elect the men to represent them, and the men representing them in any legislative branch of the Government, whether in the Senate or in the House, or in the legislatures of the various States, ought to be responsive to the public will; and the time has come when the people of the United States are going to insist upon the enactment of a law which will give them jurisdiction over their own servants.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, the greatest man Illinois ever gave to the Nation or to the world, said: "This is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people." He implicitly trusted in the plain people of this country. We on this side of the House, who believe in him and in his utterances, can safely trust this question to the people of this country. True it is that the fathers saw fit to put the provision in the Constitution as it now exists. That constitutional convention which finally adopted this great instrument was presided over by the greatest man this country ever gave to the world, George Washington, who acted as president of the constitutional convention, and deputies, representing 12 States of the Union, signed and approved this Constitution.

Here is a provision to amend that Constitution. I am in favor of the election of Senators by the people. I so voted years ago as a member of the Illinois Legislature. Every time that question has been presented in this body I have so voted.

I regret exceedingly that the movers of this amendment have seen fit to strike out these words:

But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators.

They leave in this resolution these words:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

There are to-day 46 States in the Union. Two more are knocking at the door, making 48. This provision allows 48 States to provide 48 different times, 48 different places, and 48 different manners of holding elections for Senators of the United States, without limiting in the slightest degree any power vested in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman says this will permit elections at 48 different times in 48 different places. How will he help that?

Mr. PRINCE. We can control it by limiting the manner, by limiting it except as to the places of choosing Senators. As to that we are forbidden. As to the time and place, this modifies it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PRINCE. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I hardly have the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PRINCE. What have we? This body here, made up of 392 men, comes from the body of the people. Yonder body comes from the body of the people through the selectmen. We propose to have the other body selected by the same class of people as that which selects this body.

Where do they come from? From the people. Why should we say that this body and another body coming from the body of the people shall not have the right by law to make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators? The power comes from the people. The power of this House comes from the people. We are amenable to them. We go back to them. The other body will also be amenable to the people of the United States, and I am frank to say that I believe the people will make fewer mistakes in the selection of Senators than perhaps the interests of this country have made in the selection of Senators. For that reason I favor the amendment, and if I can not get that, I will favor the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that gentlemen are unnecessarily alarmed about the provisions of this bill. In the first place, I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that under the present Constitution it is utterly impossible—

A MEMBER. Louder!

Mr. Sisson. That is the first time that request was ever made of me in my life. [Laughter.] I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that under the present Constitution Congress has no right to regulate who shall vote for the various members of the State legislature or the State senate. Therefore the States have under the present Constitution the right to provide for the election of their own legislatures in their own way, provided they do not violate any provision of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. That power is sacred, and ought to be sacred to all the States. That power is necessary to the small States like Rhode Island. It is necessary to all the States, like Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, because in yonder body they can protect and defend themselves from the strong representation that comes from the more populous and larger States. It was upon that idea that this power should live and be a vital thing and have a vital force in these smaller States that the Constitution was framed. Otherwise you never could have formed this great Government. The smaller States would never have consented to the compact. Why? Because in the House of Representatives as the large States increased in population their power correspondingly increased in the House, and relatively the smaller States would have less power. As new States are carved out of the vast territory west of the small States the

power of the small State would be less effective in the Senate to control Federal legislation. It was therefore not only put in the Constitution at the instance of the small States—the provision that no State should be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its own consent—but it was nowhere permitted in the Constitution that Congress could regulate the election of State officers; and since the power to elect Senators is placed in the various State legislatures Congress could not in any way reach the State elector or his right to vote for a State senator or representative.

Now, under this provision in this amendment it does just exactly that thing. It does no more than that. It is intended to do no more than that. It is intended that the qualifications of the State electors, when they go to vote directly for a Senator, shall be exactly what their qualifications would be if they voted for a State legislator, who, as the constitution now is, votes for a Senator because he is in the legislature of the State. Now, if you permit the authority in Article I, section 4, of the Constitution to be extended to the power that elects United States Senators, and if that power is the people, then, to leave Article I, section 4, as it is, you take away from the electors of the small States the right to send their Senators to the United States Senate with the State integrity absolutely secure from congressional interference. Senator LODGE—I believe it is against a rule of the House to call the name of a Senator—made a very strong speech, the strongest that has been made upon that proposition, that this was a direct blow at the doctrine of State sovereignty and the integrity of the State. Now, the amendment under consideration was intended to meet that objection and for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the State, and enabling each and every State to elect its own Senators by those who are qualified under their own State laws and constitutions. But if election laws could be written and prescribed by Congress, it would deprive the smaller States of that protection which they now enjoy and the safeguard which is now thrown around them. For example:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

Under the present law it does not matter what sort of regulations this Congress may make in referring to the manner of electing the Senators by the legislatures of the States. They do not and can not under the Constitution interfere with the present election laws of the States, which prescribe the qualifications of the electors for the various branches of the State legislature.

But if this clause is permitted to remain in the Constitution just as it is now, and Senators are elected by the people, then you would extend the power of Congress so that it could do with the Senators what it now does with the House of Representatives, to wit, it might prescribe election laws that differ with the election laws of the various States, and might enlarge or reduce the suffrage in each State in accordance with the wisdom of Congress. It is for that very reason that Article I, section 4, was modified by the distinguished Senator who prepared the proposed amendment. A Republican Senator of distinction prepared this bill with a great deal of care, in order that it might maintain the Government of the United States in its exact form, reserving to all the States the equal power which they now have, and not depriving the States of that power.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Even if the amendment which I have proposed should be adopted, would not the resolution contain this language?—

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

And if that be true, how can the United States interfere with the qualifications of electors of the State and reduce the number?

Mr. SISSON. That is the Constitution as it now is; but if you leave section 4 of Article I just as it is—

But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators—

That can only affect the body which now has the power to elect, which is the State legislature. The sovereign State now has the sole right to determine who shall vote for the Members of the various branches of the legislature.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. And they would still have it.

Mr. SISSON. No; they would not. The power of election of United States Senators is now lodged in a delegated body in the State, the State legislature, and that delegated body in the State having the power to elect is the only thing that could be regulated by Congress under the present Constitution. The power to regulate does not reach back to the suffrage that

elects the members of the various branches of the legislature of the several States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps a reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] may be found in this fact, that the amendment would give to the Congress of the United States control over the manner of holding elections, and while it could not determine what were the qualifications of electors, could not fix the qualifications of electors in regulating the manner of holding the election, it could pass upon the question as to who came within the qualifications as fixed by the State; and by having the power to determine whether a given individual did or did not come within the State qualifications, the Federal law might be able to override the State law; and that position was admitted by Senator ROOR.

Mr. SISSON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, who states the position that I take more clearly than I can state it, because he is always clear on every proposition.

Now, I want to call your attention to another thing. No member of any State delegation here ought to be afraid to trust the people of his State.

This Government is no better than the States. You can not make this Government any better than the States. You can not make a good government out of States that are themselves corrupt and bad. You can not make out of it any better Government than the States make themselves. Now, under the present law the great trouble is that the election of a United States Senator overshadows the State election. The qualifications of the various candidates for the State legislatures are lost sight of, and we vote for or against a man because he favors or does not favor a certain man for the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. SISSON. I thank the gentleman. Now, in those States where they have no primary election law, but have nominating conventions, the nominating convention in the county and senatorial districts will be controlled in the interest of a certain candidate for a United States Senator. Therefore we would, if we could, have election laws so that a man would vote for a State legislator or for a member of the State senate upon his qualifications for that particular office, and not because he has a preference for a certain candidate for the United States Senate. Each State must have the right, which it now has, of electing its own State officers in its own way, without disturbing in the least the integrity of the State in its own election laws. How much better it would be if, in addition to this, we could elect Senators directly, so that our State legislators would be elected on their merit, and not because they are for or against a certain candidate for the Senate. But any resolution that receives my support must be one which will not permit Congress to pass a law to supervise elections in a State.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. The power now resides in Congress to have a general supervision over the membership, and it has never been abused in the history of the country, has it?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want my distinguished friend to put it up to me to answer that question.

Mr. KENDALL. I thought that the gentleman would not want to answer it.

Mr. SISSON. If I had time, I would like to tell my distinguished friend from Iowa some facts that would cause him to be uneasy sometimes about partisan control, when passion runs high; but I thank God that that time is passed. This is no time or place to reopen the wounds of the past; they are healed. Let us not even refer to our differences of the past while discussing this great question, which means so much to our great Republic. The day is long since passed when we should inject these questions into our discussions on this floor. My distinguished young friend should not try to do this, and I will not at this time allow him to lead me into a discussion that would tend to revive the old feeling. I thank God that it has gone; and may He never send any more fratricidal strife, but may the dove of peace forever hover around this Capitol, and may we be permitted to discuss these questions apart from those recollections. [Applause.]

I come from that section which has sometimes been charged with being without patriotism and without love for the common country, but I yield to no man in my love and devotion to this Government. I can point with pride to the devotion of the noble people of the South whose faith and love for this Government have been tried in the fires of persecution and the crucible of oppression, and who have been found to be pure gold. We will defend with pride our common country with our lives, and I pledge that every able-bodied man who lives in my section of the country, if need be, will die in defense of our Federal Government. [Applause.]

So let us not go back and dig up any embers of the past in discussing this matter; let us discuss it on its merits. I have confidence in the people of Maine, in the God-fearing, honest people of Vermont and Massachusetts, California and Oregon. I believe these people may be trusted in their integrity and patriotism to do the right thing for the common country, and that our flag will not have a star dimmed in its beauty unless the Federal Government should lay violent hands upon the sovereignty of these States and deprive them of the right to handle their own local questions in their own local way. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this House—going on 17 years—I have advocated and worked faithfully to bring about the election of Senators in Congress by the direct vote of the people. In every Congress in which I have served I have introduced a joint resolution—substantially similar to the joint resolution now under consideration—to amend the Constitution to accomplish this most desirable reform, and the record will show that I have done everything in my power, in Congress and out of Congress, to secure its accomplishment.

Without any vanity I can justly say that I am the author of this reform. On several occasions my resolution has passed the House, only to fail in the Senate, but it is just as sure to be written into our Constitution, sooner or later, as the sun is to rise to-morrow.

I am opposed to delegating away the rights of the people, and where they have been delegated away I would restore them to the people. I trust the people, and I believe in the people. With Jefferson I believe that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and hence I want to restore to the people the right now delegated to the legislatures by the framers of the Constitution, so that the Senators as well as Members of Congress shall be elected directly by the people, and the Government thus become more and more a representative democracy, where brains, fitness, honesty, ability, experience, and capacity, and not wealth and subserviency, shall be the true qualifications for both branches of the Federal Legislature.

The people all over this country now demand this much-needed change in the Federal Constitution, so that they can vote directly for Senators in Congress, and they appeal to us to enact this law to give them that right. It is not a partisan question, neither is it a sectional issue. The demand reaches us from all parts of the land and from men in all political parties with a degree of unanimity that is quite surprising. It is our duty to respect the wishes of the people and to give them a uniform law allowing them to vote for Senators in Congress just the same as they now vote for Representatives in Congress.

The United States Senate is the last bulwark of the predatory trusts. Here is the citadel of every unscrupulous monopoly. And more and more the special interests of the country, realizing the importance of the Senate, are combining their forces to control the election of Federal Senators through their sinister influence in State legislatures. Forty-six United States Senators can prevent the enactment of a good law or the repeal of a bad law. The United States Senate is the most powerful legislative body in the world, and its Members should be elected by the people of the country just the same as the Representatives in Congress are elected. This is of the utmost importance to every man in the Republic, because when the Senate is directly responsible to the people they will control it; and then, and not till then, will that important legislative body respond to the will of the people.

The right to elect United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is a step in advance and in the right direction. I hope it will speedily be brought about. It is the right kind of reform, and I hope it will be succeeded by others, until this Government becomes indeed the greatest and the best and the freest Government the world has ever seen, where the will of

the people shall be, as it ought to be, the supreme law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply impressed by what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] and by other gentlemen on that side of the Chamber about the sacredness of the Constitution of the United States; about the care and the hesitancy with which we should approach it in any attempt to alter it in any material respect. I am firmly convinced that as eras have produced great explorers or poets or soldiers, so there are times in the affairs of men when great jurists and great statesmen execute an immortal work, not for a single generation, but for all their children and their children's children who are to follow them in the succeeding centuries. I believe that Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton and Washington erected an edifice so perfect in all its details, so beautiful in its structure, so firm and immutable in its foundations, that it shall live through the centuries, and that when nations and languages and empires shall have perished, the Constitution of the United States, still intact and still preserving these institutions under the flag, shall be the wonder and the admiration of all men a thousand years from now. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman in his eulogy of Washington and Jefferson and Hamilton and Madison and those other great men, to found it largely upon their magnificent work in making the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the question.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman when he spoke with such splendor of language and imagery of Washington, of Jefferson, of Hamilton, and Madison, and other great men, that he was at the same time eulogizing or speaking in complimentary terms of their master product, the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STANLEY. In my feeble way I intended to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman please tell me what Thomas Jefferson had to do with the Constitution? He was not in the convention at all. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will take pleasure in doing so. The Declaration of Independence itself was the spirit of which the Constitution is the letter. [Applause.] I happen to have here in my desk a letter from Thomas Jefferson to Mr. Madison, and I thought I could lay my hands on it, discussing this very question. It is true that the Sage of Monticello throughout that discussion before the Constitution was written, and after it was written, was consulted by the men who wrote it as an oracle and as a guide. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is true that to Thomas Jefferson more than to any other we owe the Bill of Rights, now in the Constitution, which is in verity the shield and sword to the oppressed of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would commend to the gentleman to study the life, the writings, and the achievements of Thomas Jefferson. With his splendid intellect, with his broad statesmanship, could he get out of the bog, cease to follow the narrow politicians, and stand for a few months under the effulgence of Jefferson's eloquence and his wisdom, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin would surely adorn this side of the Chamber. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I want the gentleman to understand that my query proceeds from a friendly motive.

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In an endeavor to arrive at a compromise that will be approved by the people and by the legislatures, if possible, I desire to ask if we who are opposed to the surrender of the supervisory power of the Federal Government which has never been exercised, in our opinion, to the detriment of the South, are asking the gentlemen on the other side to surrender or give up anything that they are now entitled to under the Constitution when we ask them to simply be satisfied with a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators without going further and asking for an additional amendment to the Constitution which destroys its symmetry, which destroys section 4, splits it in twain, and leaves the anomalous condition of the Federal Congress having the authority, if it should ever come to pass that it was proper for it to exercise that authority, to supervise the election of Representatives, and no longer having authority to amend any regu-

lations that may be made in regard to Senators? And I would desire the gentleman now to answer—and I am friendly to the resolution—whether or not it would not be better for the gentlemen on the other side to be satisfied—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Kentucky, and forbid anybody interfering with him in that time. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would answer the question of my friend from Oregon had he propounded a question. [Laughter.] Now, if all that the gentleman says is true, the only thing that this amendment does is to give to the States the power that it has never exercised in a hundred years and will probably never exercise in the next hundred years.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, why gentlemen on the other side—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In the same friendly motive, I would ask why gentlemen on the other side object to leaving the Constitution in that regard stand just where it is and be satisfied with an amendment for the direct election of Senators.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not object to leaving the Constitution stay just where it is, and I am of the opinion it will be found in the same locality whether we pass this amendment or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit.

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps the answer to the gentleman from Oregon might be found in the fact that when you provide for the direct election of Senators by the people, you do then enlarge the power that the Federal Government will have over the power that it now possesses when they are elected by the legislatures of the various States, and it is not possible, as stated by the gentleman, to offer simply an amendment for the direct election of Senators and leave the situation in that particular in statu quo.

Mr. STANLEY. Now, speaking in all seriousness to my friend from Oregon, the founders of the Constitution discussed at great length the wisdom of allowing the States to be represented according to their population in this body and in another body according to their autonomy. Thomas Jefferson, immediately after the passage of the Constitution, wrote to Madison and said that he was delighted with the compromise made between the large and the small States at that time. The manner of the election of United States Senators was a detail which was almost entirely overlooked by the makers of the Constitution. This amendment does not take any power from the Constitution which it now possesses, because over the method of election of United States Senators by the legislatures the Federal Government was absolutely prevented from interfering with their election, not in *hac verba*, but from the very nature of things. It is not contended that the Federal Government ever has or ever can interfere—

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I desire to ask the necessity, if there be any necessity, in submitting this constitutional amendment or making any provision for the amending of section 4, which reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

Mr. STANLEY. I am speaking to that point right now. The Congress never has and never will interfere with the time, the manner, or the places of selecting Senators under the law as it now exists. Will this Congress ever think of interfering—

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In order to arrive at a decision it is necessary to ask the question—I do not desire to interfere or to be presumptuous in the matter—

Mr. STANLEY. I know it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I want to ask this question: If Congress has never interfered, there ought not, it seems to me, to be any fear that it ever will; but in the very nature of things it shocks the conscience or the intelligence of a lawyer, as suggested by the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Mc-

CALL], that Congress should surrender the power of providing for its own perpetuity.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman that in different language he has asked me the same question four different times.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] declines to yield further.

Mr. STANLEY. I will let the gentleman finish that question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Since it does appear that there is a division upon that material point between the North and the South, as you understand, as to the surrender of this power, which is not material according to the gentleman's own statement—

Mr. STANLEY. I wish to be patient with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAFFERTY (continuing). Why burden the amendment with it?

Mr. STANLEY. I desire to be courteous, but I hope to finish this sentence, and I will not have any more time than is necessary to do that. Now, in effect, we are not depriving the Federal Government of any actual power which it now possesses. It could not in the nature of things interfere with the election, by the very wording of the Constitution, of members of the legislature or of Senators. The States have the sole and the absolute right to choose the members of both bodies of the legislature without any interference by the Federal Government. Those members, when elected, in the very nature of things, have the right to fix the manner of the election of United States Senators. The reasons which have led the Federal Government to interfere with the election of Members of this body, being founded upon representation, upon population, there has come, and there may come, a clash between the Federal and the State Governments.

The number of Senators being absolutely fixed by the Constitution, the details of their election being arranged under the Constitution, as it now exists, the Federal Government never could, never has, and never can successfully interfere with a State in the selection of her Senators.

The whole purpose of this amendment is simply to allow the people, acting directly, to exercise their power just as they do now when acting through the members of the legislature.

I favor this amendment because it is a mere detail that the framers of the Constitution could not anticipate. The personnel of the Senate for 50 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States shows that Senators then were responsive to and were named by the people. Conditions have changed, both social and industrial, so that it becomes necessary that we should now change the method of electing United States Senators in order that they may be directly responsive to the people and be named by them, as they were in the days when the Constitution was first adopted.

Your fears are unfounded for another reason. You must remember that when the Constitution of the United States was adopted there were two mooted questions, one of which was whether a State was absolutely sovereign, clothed with the right to retire peacefully from this bond of sisterhood.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like one minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman the time he desires in which to finish the sentence.

Mr. STANLEY. The other position was that the States were indestructible. The question of the right of a State to secede has been settled by the arbitrament of war. From that hour until this the indestructibility of the State is the thing that has been in danger. If this Government is ever destroyed, it will be because of the fact that we have become a compact Federal Union, an empire, and not because the States have encroached upon the rights of the Federal Government. Those who would preserve the Union as founded by the fathers need not look with a jealous eye upon the authority of the States as such, but we owe it to ourselves to preserve and encourage the States in exercising to the utmost all of their local authority and preserving inviolate their local autonomy. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am most heartily in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and there can be no question but that the people of the United States are in favor of electing United States Senators by direct vote of the people. The Democratic Party has stood for this for many years. The Democratic Party in the last three national conventions has passed a resolution declaring that its members were in favor of the election of United States

Senators by direct vote of the people. The people of the State of California for the last 20 years have been studying and trying in every way possible how they might secure a representation in the United States Senate of their choice, selected by the people and not by the system, and I have presented here a resolution that passed the State Legislature of California in favor of electing Senators of the United States by the people. We in California passed a constitutional amendment giving the State legislature the power to adopt a law so that we may designate our choice by a direct vote of the people, and at the last legislature we succeeded in passing a bill which is, in substance, the law of Oregon, providing that the people might express their will and might put up to their State senators and representatives the question as to how they stand upon that subject of election of United States Senators in order that the voters might vote intelligently and in order that the great body of the people might be represented and know where their representatives stood on this subject before they were elected.

But I want to ask my friends on this side of the House, in what Democratic convention, or at what time, or at what place it has ever been discussed, it has ever been determined as a question of Democratic principle, that we should amend paragraph 1 of section 4 of Article I of the Constitution? [Applause on the Republican side.] At what time have we ever gone before the American people telling them that while we were in favor of electing United States Senators by direct vote of the people, we were in favor of changing that wise provision of the law which gives this Congress the power to supervise the election of Representatives and the election of Senators? [Applause on the Republican side.]

And now I appeal to you, my Democratic friends, and I want you to think before you vote on this side. If we are in good faith, if we are in earnest, if we are determined that this proposed constitutional amendment to the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I shall go to the several States and be adopted, and thereby give the people the right to elect the United States Senators by direct vote, let us put the amendment in the form that has been discussed for the last 20 years by the American people and the form that they stand for. Do not have a rider to it. Do not put something to it that they have never discussed. You know that State after State in this Union may defeat this proposed constitutional amendment that we are so ardent for, that we have prayed so long for, that we have deserved—that we might have it for the purpose of rectifying the wrongs that have been committed, that we might have it for the purpose of giving the people a chance in the United States Senate and dragging from that body the moneybags, and putting men in there who will represent the people and not the system, if we burden it with too many riders. [Applause.] I ask my Democratic friends now—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing my approval of the principle of the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people. I believe now, as I have believed for years, that the Constitution of the United States should be amended so as to permit the electors of the several States to elect the United States Senators by direct vote as they now elect Representatives in Congress. It is unfortunate that the proposed amendment is made objectionable by the provision which takes from Congress the authority, as provided in Article I, section 4, of the Constitution, to control the times and manner of electing Senators, but leaves Congress the authority to control the manner of electing Representatives in Congress. This injects a new question into the proposition, which in the end may defeat the amendment itself. If so, the Democratic majority in this House will be responsible for the defeat of the legislation that is so universally demanded by the people. I shall vote to amend the resolution so as to present the one proposition, allowing the people to vote directly in the election of Senators; but if this amendment shall be lost, I shall then vote for the proposed amendment to the Constitution as it comes from the committee, trusting to the other branch of the Congress to properly amend the proposition so as to make it unobjectionable.

I shall vote for the amendment to the Constitution for the following reasons:

First. Because I believe in so doing I express the will of the great majority of my constituents, and while I remain a Member of this House I shall always feel it my duty to represent

my constituents in every vote I cast. I represent a district very evenly divided in politics, and in casting my vote for this measure I believe I express the will of my constituents—Democrats, Socialists, and Republicans alike.

Second. I am in favor of this amendment, because my own judgment approves it. In affairs of our National Government, and especially in legislative matters, I am in favor of the distribution rather than in the concentration of power. I believe it is safer to let all the electors vote on the election of Senators than to limit the number to the very few who may happen to be elected members of the various legislatures.

Third. I believe, on the average, better men will be elected to the United States Senate. By this I do not mean to reflect upon those who have been elected to the Senate under our present system. But under the present system unknown men are often elected to the Senate as so-called "dark horses." If the people elect directly, the men elected will be more apt to be men who have attained great prominence in the State, who have a wide reputation for ability, and who are known for their integrity and high character.

Fourth. In my opinion, the change in the manner of election of Senators will give us, on the whole, better laws and wiser legislation. If we get better men, we will have better laws, because the ability, patriotism, and character of legislators will always be reflected in the laws which they enact.

Fifth. I believe, when elected by a direct vote of the people, Senators will be more responsive to the will of the people. A Senator is elected for a term of six years. To my mind, it seems wise that after six years of service he should go back to his State and submit his record to the electors of his State.

Sixth. In my judgment this change in the manner of electing Senators will tend, at least, toward the purity of the election of Senators. Corrupt methods may be used even when the people shall vote directly, but the danger is not so great, and it is more difficult to corrupt the people constituting the many than to corrupt the legislators constituting the few. There are other reasons that I might give, if I had the time, but my time is limited.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to have one minute more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe my colleague [Mr. FERRIS] is not in the Hall of the House at this time. I regret he is not here. In his remarks a few minutes ago he criticized the Republican Party for not enacting this legislation during its long lease of power. I wish to remind the gentleman that it was the Republican State of Oregon that first adopted the legislation that in practice permitted the people to elect their Senators by direct vote, even without any constitutional authority therefor. And that, notwithstanding this example set by the Republican State of Oregon, the Democratic leaders of Oklahoma who controlled the constitutional convention which framed the constitution of the State of Oklahoma, and have controlled by large majorities the legislatures of our State, have failed to give the people of Oklahoma any opportunity to express, at the general election, their choice for United States Senators. This, too, in face of the fact that Republicans have been demanding that the people be given this right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal I can not hope to add anything to the broad question of the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. Personally I am in favor of that proposition. It would be academic for me to refer to the principles that were advocated by the framers of the Constitution when the provision which we are considering was drafted into it. The words of Roger Sherman and of Gerry and others of that time indicate that some of them were imbued with the idea that the Senate should be a body that would represent the wealth of this country; that would represent the interests as against the masses of the people; that should be elected by a few because the people dare not be trusted. I shall not argue this point, because I take it that the majority of the Members of this body believe, as I believe, in the intelligence and the responsibility of the people.

I do, however, want to call attention to one or two matters that have arisen this afternoon with respect to the amendments that have been proposed and the substitute that was offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The gentleman in addressing himself to his substitute, as I understand it, indicated that he was fearful that the language of the proposed

constitutional amendment, if adopted, would give to the States the power to provide in any way they might choose for the election of Senators, taking away from the people that which we seek to give to them, the power of electing Senators.

Only a word with respect to that. It seems to me the language in lines 6, 7, and 8 nullifies his argument, because that language is to the effect that the qualifications of electors of Senators shall be those requisite for the "electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

And more than that, lines 15, 16, and 17 indicate that that is the meaning of this whole amendment, when the language reads, with respect to the filling of vacancies, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments "until the people fill the vacancy by election." Words could hardly be plainer, and I am opposed to the substitute, and pass from its discussion to another point that has been raised, namely, to the question whether or not we shall delegate to the States the power to elect the Senators without the United States Congress exercising control over the manner of the election.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment that has been proposed. I believe in passing the amendment to the Constitution, however, in such a manner as will appeal to the most of the States of the Union. If the one manner will appeal to most of them, I am for that manner; if the other manner, I am for that manner, because I believe the reservation to the Congress of the right to control election of Senators is not a vital principle that we need to stumble over. As I see it, the essence of the question is the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

I find myself in favor of that proposition, even without congressional control, for two reasons. In the first place, I believe that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution provide an adequate safeguard of the citizenship of this country, and that in addition to this a sufficient safeguard of our form of government is found in the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government. In the second place, I find myself in accord with it when I reflect that the people of this country to-day, the people of the several States, have already as great a responsibility upon them as is involved in the election of Senators, and they have proven themselves worthy of the responsibility. For more than a century our people have full well assumed the responsibility involved in the election of governors, the election of supreme courts, the election of Members of this great body, and the determining of the great policies and problems confronting the different Commonwealths, and for that reason I am for the amendment to the Constitution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. DYER. Mr. Speaker, it is well and generally known that this is the most important question concerning our organic law that has come up for consideration and decision since the adoption of the Constitution, and I agree that there is much force in the argument that in so important a matter as destroying the principle upon which the Constitution was founded we should deliberate long and well. The only other amendments to the Constitution have been to secure human rights or to change the mechanism for the election of a President. This amendment changes the Constitution in one of its important principles.

When the Constitution was framed and adopted, its makers were composed of our most able and learned statesmen. They believed at that time that the best plan was to have United States Senators elected by the legislatures of the several States forming the Union. They did not believe that the people at that time should be intrusted with the direct election of Senators. We are all well acquainted with the arguments and reasons given at that time for their action. In favoring this amendment to-day we are not questioning their judgment of that day. Experience and time are the best teachers, however, and from them and from long consideration by the American people I am thoroughly convinced that the best interests of this Government and of its people lies in the adoption of this amendment, thereby giving to the people the right to elect their Senators by direct vote and not by the State legislatures. The judgment of the people, when formed after long and serious intelligent consideration, is the best criterion for those to go by who have been intrusted with making the laws. The people want to elect by direct vote United States Senators—their minds are made up on that proposition. They have had some splendid lessons in the necessity of taking away from State legislatures this right. We all know that it is best that this amendment should pass. There is no division of this House as regards this amendment on partisan lines. Upon this side, as well as upon the other, we are all in favor of the principle involved in this resolution. The American people are in favor

of it, and it is proper and right that they should be; so I will not dwell at length upon this proposition, because there is practically no contention regarding it.

To me there is one thing to be seriously considered, and that is the part of the resolution which provides for an amendment of section 4 of Article I, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, which is in the following language:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.

It is proposed in this resolution to amend and strike out that portion of the Constitution which gives to Congress the right to regulate the election of Senators in the States, and to give this power over entirely to the State legislatures, so that it would read as follows:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

I am opposed to that proposition; I am opposed to Congress giving up its powers of regulating and having a supervisory power over the election of United States Senators. Not that this power will probably be exercised, but the fact that it is known to exist would have a tendency to cause corrupt legislatures, such as has been known to exist in many States in recent years, to honestly and fairly provide for holding elections for United States Senators.

I therefore shall vote in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], to retain to the Congress of the United States the power to regulate the manner and time of holding elections for Senators. If you gentlemen of the majority by your votes transfer this power from Congress to the State legislatures, you will be held to account by the American people. We are amending the Constitution so as to take away from State legislatures the power of choosing Senators because they have in many cases abused their power. Now, the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] proposes to give the legislatures additional power as to the time, manner, and place of electing Senators and to deprive the Congress of the United States of a rightful supervision over this matter, a supervision which Congress never has and never would abuse. You make a serious mistake, in my judgment, to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], thereby depriving Congress of the rights it is now given in this regard by the Constitution. However, I am for the resolution. I prefer it be amended as above indicated, but, whether amended or not, I intend voting for it and thus give to the people the right and power that they demand—rightfully demand—being proud indeed of the honor to cast my first vote in this House in favor of so important a matter, one that is so universally demanded and so universally needed. This Government will never suffer by listening to and granting the demands of the American people. [Applause.]

MR. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nye].

MR. NYE. Mr. Speaker, there is but one question which seems to be an issue. I believe that history is a record of persistent human advance, and that the movement of the American people toward the exercise of more direct and more complete regulation of legislation and of the election of their officers is coming and will come to stay. I believe in this, I believe in the essential thing in this resolution, the election of United States Senators by the people. If the people make mistakes, let them make mistakes. The world is full of mistakes. We learn by making mistakes.

But we do touch upon a question which seems to me to be sacred, the one that eliminates from the Constitution the power given to Congress to legislate as to the manner and time of the election of Federal officers. Under that clause of the Constitution Congress has passed legislation. Back, I think, in 1872 such legislation was passed. I call attention of the House to some of the statements or language of the Supreme Court of the United States while passing upon this legislation.

It is impossible in the time that I have to give any thorough consideration to these cases. The first one that I have in mind is reported in 100 United States Reports, and is the case of *Ex Parte Siebold*, a habeas corpus case. The other is reported in 110 United States, and is the case of *Ex Parte Yarbrough*. These cases involve the laws which were passed regulating elections of Federal officers, Representatives, and Federal officials. I call attention to some of the language used by Mr. Justice Miller in the case which I last mentioned, and I can, of course, only read a small portion of the opinion:

That a government whose essential character is republican, whose executive head and legislative body are both elective, whose most numerous and powerful branch of the legislature is elected by the people directly has no power by appropriate laws to secure this election

from the influence of violence, of corruption, and of fraud is a proposition so startling as to arrest attention and demand the gravest consideration.

If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments, each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections on which its existence depends from violence and corruption.

If it has not this power, it is left helpless before the two great natural and historical enemies of all republics—open violence and insidious corruption.

Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body [the Congress] to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections? To provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result? And especially to provide, in an election held under its own authority, for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes, from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud?

If this be so, and it is not doubted, are such powers annulled because an election for State officers is held at the same time and place? Is it any less important that the election of Members of Congress should be the free choice of all the electors because State officers are to be elected at the same time?

These questions answer themselves; and it is only because the Congress of the United States, through long habit and long years of forbearance, has, in deference and respect to the States, refrained from the exercise of these powers that they are now doubted.

But when in pursuance of a new demand for action that body, as it did in the cases just enumerated, finds it necessary to make additional laws for the free, the pure, and the safe exercise of this right of voting, they stand upon the same ground and are to be upheld for the same reasons.

If this were conceded, the importance to the General Government of having the actual election—the voting for those members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualification of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes. It equally affects the Government, it is as indispensable to the proper discharge of the great function of legislating for that Government, that those who are to control this legislation shall not owe their election to bribery or violence, whether the class of persons who shall vote is determined by the law of the State or by law of the United States or by their united result.

In conclusion the court says:

If the Government of the United States has within its constitutional domain no authority to provide against these evils, if the very sources of power may be poisoned by corruption or controlled by violence and outrage, without legal restraint, then, indeed, is the country in danger, and its best powers, its highest purposes, the hopes which it inspires, and the love which enshrines it, are at the mercy of the combinations of those who respect no right but brute force, on the one hand, and unprincipled corruptionists on the other.

Mr. Speaker, this case and the other that I referred to deals with legislation which was passed pursuant to this clause of the Constitution which we have debated here this afternoon and from both cases it would seem that the legislation rested wholly and purely upon that clause, a clause which seems to me to be sacred. I do not understand why gentlemen in the House want to take this out of the Constitution, at least upon so hasty consideration.

Can we afford to divest Congress of a constitutional power which in its very nature is essential to the preservation of the Nation? What emergencies may arise in the future we can not tell, nor in what State or section nor at what time. But the provision is a wise one and was designed to provide against any condition of lawlessness or corruption that might defeat or tend to defeat honest elections of Federal officers.

We do not distrust the people of any State, as intimidated by gentlemen on the other side, but in matters of Federal supremacy our trust should be in all the people rather than a part. I regard the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan as essential, because it leaves, as the framers of the Constitution intended, this necessary power with the whole people. The amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are involved in this proposed amendment two propositions. The one providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is the first one. That, I think, practically every Member of the House is in favor of. I regret that anyone should undertake to gain, or to try to gain, any partisan advantage in the discussion of this particular proposition. I have no desire to discuss it in any partisan way whatever, but I want briefly to call the attention of my friends on the other side—those who undertook to make political capital out of it when they were boasting of the fact that the Republican Party had not seen fit to place this amendment in the Constitution when they were in power in both branches of the National Legislature—to the fact that when the Democratic Party was likewise in power in both branches of the Congress it likewise failed to put it in the Constitution or to submit the amendment.

As I have said, this resolution to amend the Constitution contains two separate and independent propositions. The first one, as I have mentioned, is the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people. The other one is to change section 4 of Article I of the Constitution by taking away

from Congress the power and the right to legislate in regard to the election of United States Senators and give such control entirely and exclusively to the several States. These two changes in the Constitution are combined in this one resolution to amend. Unless the resolution can be amended, we must accept both of these amendments or reject them both. They have no connection with each other; they refer to separate parts of the Constitution, and I can see no logical reason why they should be combined in this way. The proposed amendment to take this power to legislate in regard to senatorial elections away from Congress and give it to the States has never received, so far as I know, the approval of any political party, and has never been favored by any considerable portion of our people. If we adopt the amendment to this resolution proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, the effect of such amendment will be to take out of the resolution that part which proposes to take this jurisdiction and power of legislation in regard to senatorial elections away from Congress. It will leave intact the proposition to elect Senators by a direct vote of the people. It is, in my judgment, to be very seriously regretted that the gentlemen who have charge of this resolution have seen fit to combine these two propositions into one. I am extremely anxious, and I believe the country is extremely anxious, to change the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people themselves; but there are many citizens all over the country who, while they favor the election of Senators by direct vote, are conscientiously and unalterably opposed to the proposition of taking away from Congress the right to control congressional elections.

While, personally, I think it would be unwise to take this power away from Congress, yet I do not regard it myself as a serious proposition, and the greatest objection I have to incorporating these two propositions together is that there is great danger of defeating the main proposition by so doing. You will give to some of the special interests throughout the country who are opposed to electing Senators by a direct vote an opportunity to get behind this other objection and thus defeat what we are really trying to accomplish. Other men who seriously object to this other change but yet honestly think we ought to elect Senators by direct vote will be inclined to oppose the adoption of the amendment because you have coupled on to the proposition which they favor another proposition which they condemn, and it will therefore lose many votes and much of its force.

This resolution to become effective must be approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. If we are in earnest, if we want to give the people of the country the right and the opportunity to change the Constitution and provide for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, then let us in good faith amend this resolution so that it will provide only for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. There would be no doubt, in my judgment, of the approval of this amendment by a sufficient number of the legislatures if we would submit it in this simple form and not couple it up with something that many people honestly and conscientiously oppose. If you desire to submit an amendment on this additional change, then let it be a separate amendment. Let each one stand on its own merits and then the legislatures can choose both if they want to, but they will have the right to reject one and accept the other. The danger is that this amendment in its present form will fail because you have coupled on with a popular and desirable proposition one that is not demanded by the people and is condemned by a large number of people all through the country.

I want also to call his attention to the fact that at the present time, had the Democratic provision contained in the Democratic national platform been complied with by the Members of the United States Senate belonging to the Democratic Party, we would have the question now submitted to the legislatures of the several States.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not exactly understand, Mr. Speaker. Is the gentleman making some assault on some Democratic Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I am not; I am simply answering a couple of gentlemen over on that side of the House who undertook to lay all the blame on the Republican Party because we had not before had the election of United States Senators by direct vote, and I want to say that, as a matter of fact, the men who are against the election of United States Senators by direct vote are in my party and they are in yours, and those who are in favor of it are likewise in both parties.

Under no circumstances do I want to impugn the motives of any man regardless of his politics on this question, and yet I heard the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] say in this debate that he was almost brought to the conclusion that there

was something ulterior in the motives of men who wanted to amend this proposition, this resolution to change the Constitution, and I thought a complete answer to that would be that for the same reason it might be said that we should be ready to impugn your motives because you have two propositions to amend in this resolution. You have coupled with one that everybody favors another one about which there is a serious dispute as to whether it ought to be adopted or not. Everybody here is in favor, as far as I know, of the amendment providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. In a moment. Why, then, for God's sake, should you couple that proposition with another proposition that men are divided on and that is going to control the votes of many men on this proposition, not only here but before the legislatures of the different States, and which may defeat the whole thing? This amendment will have to be approved by three-fourths of the legislatures, and you have coupled two propositions together, one that is popular and everybody wants, as I take it, and—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Can I have a little more time?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I can yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. And you have coupled it with another proposition which to me does not mean very much. I will favor the resolution whether the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is adopted or not, but there are men all over the United States, conscientious and honest, who are going to oppose in the legislatures of the States the approval of this amendment unless you take out of it everything except the simple election of United States Senators by the people.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman states that all on that side favor the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

Mr. NORRIS. If I said that, I will say all as far as I know. I do not know of any man who is against it on either side of this House.

Mr. JAMES. Is not it true that the gentleman's own political party has never yet had the courage in national convention to declare for it in any form?

Mr. NORRIS. That is true, but while your own political party had the courage to put that in your platform, yet when you had an opportunity in the United States Senate to redeem that pledge to the people you failed to do it.

Mr. JAMES. No; that is not true.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is a long time ago, before they commenced buying up legislatures.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I say it has been a long time since we had power in the United States Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; in the last Congress you had votes enough on the Democratic side to submit this proposition if they had all voted for it.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, no.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say I have not looked the record up, but I think that is true. If the Democrats had voted solidly for this platform pledge, of which you boast, this proposition would have passed last Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why, certainly; of course.

Mr. NORRIS. I have favored the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people during all my public life. The evils of the present system are so great and so apparent that it seems to me this change ought to appeal to every reasonable thinking citizen. Within the observation of us all there has always been whenever the time comes for the election of United States Senators several State legislatures that have devoted their entire session to the consideration of this one subject alone, and very often without results. The State legislatures have duties to perform to their own States, and should be able to give their undivided attention to the discussion and the consideration of laws pertaining to their respective States. Wherever, however, a United States Senator is to be elected this question overshadows all other questions, and very often prevents the legislature from giving consideration to and passing the necessary bills of which the States sometimes are sorely in need. It is not an uncommon thing for an entire session of the legislature to be frittered away because of a deadlock on the question of the election of a United States Senator. Needed legislation is forgotten. The real duties pertaining to the membership are unperformed and not given proper consideration on account of the election of the United States Senator. The State laws are just as important to the people as national legislation, and often of more importance. Moreover, the present system is not fair to the individual voter. He often finds it

impossible for him to express his choice at the ballot box as between a candidate for United States Senator and a candidate who represents his own ideas as to State laws and State regulation who is running for the State legislature.

The voter often is compelled to vote against a man for the State legislature who agrees with him absolutely and entirely as to his views regarding what laws should be enacted and put upon the statute books in his State, because only by so voting can he vote for a man who does agree with him as to who should represent the State in the United States Senate. The citizen must often surrender one conviction or the other and in such case, if he would work and vote for the candidate who would stand for his ideas of State government and State laws, he must surrender his conviction and not only give up his choice as to United States Senator, but he must vote for a man whom he knows will vote against his preference for United States Senator.

We have reached a stage in the development of political and social problems where great combinations of wealth have often too much influence in the framing of laws and in the selection of public officials. Too often it has been disclosed, in the history of the last 15 or 20 years, that money has taken too important a part in the control of the legislature when it comes to the election of a United States Senator, until it had almost become common knowledge among our people that no poor man need apply. In other cases men have been elected to the Senate through the legislature by trading patronage for legislative votes. Members of the legislature who give their votes for the successful candidate have been rewarded by having dealt out to them some fat political job, or if not to them directly, to some of their closest friends. It is a question in my mind whether an election controlled by patronage is not a greater evil than one which is controlled directly by money. Both are wrong; both ought to be eradicated, and both ought to be made impossible. The purchasing of an office directly by money in some respects at least is not as bad and not as much evil follows from it as though the bargain and sale were made for a consideration of official place and patronage. When the deal is made with money, the contract is ended when the votes are delivered and the person elected, but when the office is purchased by the giving of patronage or position, then the Government very likely secures the appointment of incompetent, if not dishonest, men and so the taxpayers must pay in the end for the unholy alliance.

I do not charge that these things have occurred often or frequently, but there are none of us who can not call to mind in recent years or in recent days many illustrations of this kind. During the present winter several legislatures frittered away the entire legislative session in senatorial deadlock. In some instances there has been no charge, either direct or indirect, of any dishonesty or anything wrong. Men simply disagreed as to who should be their Senator. In other cases the newspapers have been filled with charges of all kinds, where it has been openly charged that money has been offered and refused, and in other cases where positions of honor, profit, and trust in official place have been offered in return for political votes, and in one of the great States of the Union the disclosures have been so remarkable and have shown such a disgraceful and dishonorable condition of barter and sale that it must bring the blush of shame to the countenance of every honest, patriotic citizen.

If Senators were elected by a direct vote of the people, these things could not occur. In a government founded upon the consent of the governed the largest possible participation in governmental affairs on the part of the people themselves is to be desired. It has been argued in the past by those who have opposed this amendment that the people themselves are not as well qualified to elect a Senator as are the members of the State legislatures. I am confident that the past history of our senatorial elections has demonstrated that this is an error. I do not expect the change to bring about perfection; that can not come to any government composed of mortal men. Mistakes will be made by the people, but if it is the people's government and they desire to select their officials and make mistakes, they themselves will be responsible. They will undoubtedly profit by whatever mistakes they may make. In addition to this, this new responsibility placed upon the shoulders of the citizens will have a tendency to increase the intelligence and the interest that people generally will take in these elections. When you place a new responsibility upon an intelligent and honest man, he does the best he can to prepare himself for the proper performance of his new duty, to intelligently inform himself as to the best way he can perform his additional responsibility. There is no doubt but what the citizenship of our country generally are dissatisfied with the present

method of selecting United States Senators. They have seen too many cases where the will of the people has been absolutely nullified and where special interests and wealthy combinations have succeeded in absolutely naming the United States Senator.

The Senate of the United States is one of the highest and most honorable tribunals in the civilized world. I have great respect for its membership. It has to-day upon its roll some of our greatest statesmen, our ablest men, our most patriotic citizens. The history of our country shows that liberty and freedom have had many able defenders in this forum. This change of electing them by the people will not detract from the ability of the Senate. It will relieve it, however, of all suspicion of being too far removed from the people themselves and of all charge of its Members being too often elected by the illegal use of money and political patronage. It will prevent the election to the United States Senate of some Members who have not honored it in the past and who could under no circumstances be elected to the Senate if the entire citizenship had a voice in the settlement of the question.

This change is demanded by almost a unanimous sentiment of well-meaning and patriotic people. Our forefathers, in framing the Constitution, were not confronted with many of the great questions that confront us to-day. They were not called upon then to make any laws in regard to great railroads and transportation companies, because in those days there were no railroads. Neither were they called upon to consider the question of great combinations of capital and wealth, because in that day there was nothing similar to the great combinations that have grown up under modern conditions. A great many other dissimilarities between the conditions then and now might be mentioned. It is but reasonable for us to recognize what is recognized by all the people—that these great corporations and combinations have too much of a voice in modern legislation. Their activities in politics and in legislation have created prejudice against them that, in some instances perhaps, goes too far. But there can be no doubt but what their activities in legislation in many cases have resulted in laws that gave them an unfair advantage over the ordinary person.

This is a step toward placing the real government in the hands of the people themselves. It is upon the citizens that we depend for stability as a government. It is upon the patriotic, common, industrious people of our country that our Government must always lean in time of danger and distress. To this class of people, then, we should give the right to control by direct election the selection of our public officials and to permit each citizen who is a part of the sinew and backbone of our Government in time of danger to exercise his influence by direct vote in time of peace.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Missouri use a little of his time now?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say to-day that I represented the Legislature of Rhode Island, but I feel confident in saying that I represent the people of Rhode Island in giving my advocacy and vote to the proposed amendment directing the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. It may seem strange for me to say that I do not represent the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, but to you it will be made very plain when I state that the legislature of that State does not represent the people of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Rhode Island unfortunately is one of those distinct cases to which we can point unerringly as a victim of archaic laws and a moribund constitution. And I am gratified that the Democracy is in power in this House, in order that we may take a short cut across lots in Rhode Island and give to the people the power to vote for United States Senators, and in that way help them materially to an enjoyment of liberties which have been suppressed by moth-eaten charters. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To-day in the State of Rhode Island they are battling for an enlarged franchise, which is to my mind a convertible term for an enlarged freedom. I can better illustrate it by telling you that the city of Providence, with a population of 225,000 people and a qualified electorate of 29,030, is represented in the State senate of Rhode Island by one member, and that another section of the population, containing 40,398 people and 5,620 qualified voters, is represented in the same senate by 20 senators. You can easily see the disproportion; and you can easily recognize how derelict I would be in my duty if I did not say something for poor, downtrodden Rhode Island to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it is that condition, and it is that frightful misrepresentation, a minority of the people,

a fraction, practically, of the people, represented in the legislature through a rotten borough system, that sent for so many years to the United States the gentleman who gave the Democratic Party its great opportunity when he wrote into the laws the odious and malodorous Payne-Aldrich tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We can take virtue from that condition, and we can exercise a little joy in the thought that the gentleman misrepresenting the State of Rhode Island in the United States Senate did not represent the people of the State of Rhode Island, but did represent only a poor fraction or minority of them.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman has spoken of the inequality of representation in the Rhode Island Legislature. Would the gentleman favor an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would only give Rhode Island a representation in the Senate of the United States to which it is entitled by its population? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would not; and I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that that is a sort of threadbare argument down my way and they have been harping on it for a century. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much, profoundly, in fact, in favor of this amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I believe that it will do away with the contest of moneybags. I believe it will restore the representation of the people to where it belongs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want but one minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. In the opportunity given to me to-day I wish to emphasize my thorough accord with an enlarged franchise. I wish to emphasize my thorough accord with the principle that the people should rule; and if there is any place in this whole country where that opportunity is awaited more impatiently than in another it is in the little State of Rhode Island. I can say, possibly with some sorrow for my brethren on the Republican side of the House, that once we get this amendment to the Constitution and once we have the popular election of Senators in the State of Rhode Island I believe firmly, just as sure as I am standing here, that we shall have two Democratic Senators representing that State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, the most interesting feature of this debate is the evidence which it affords of the growth of a democratic idea whose evolution has been continuously and pertinaciously opposed, by the reactionary thought of this country.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to undertake to discuss at this time the conditions, and underlying reasons which have brought about the great change in the popular attitude toward the election of Senators by the people. It is well understood that the country favors this principle. Hence the unanimity with which the gentlemen on the minority side have come forward to commit themselves to its support. But after declaring themselves in favor of the principle, they find a stumbling block in the way of supporting the pending bill, in the fact that the proposed amendment does not contain the present provision of the Constitution relating to the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections. They seem to apprehend danger in that portion of the joint resolution which gives to the respective States the right to control the time, place, and manner of holding the elections contemplated by the amendment.

I wish to discuss briefly this ground of objection, and to show why in my judgment the power to control the time, place, and manner of holding these elections should be given to the States. Some gentlemen say that when you take away this power from the Congress, you will impair the symmetry of the Constitution. Whenever you engraft upon the Constitution the principle of electing Senators by the people, you will thereby so impair the symmetry of the instrument as it came from the craftsmen who provided with such care against the popular selection of these officials that the additional impairment involved in extending to the States the right to control their election may well be overlooked. But why do I contend that this feature of the Constitution relative to the control of Congress over the time and manner of holding elections should be eliminated from that instrument? For this very sufficient reason, Mr. Speaker, that no one has ever been able to ascertain the extent of the

power conferred by the present language upon the Congress of the United States.

It has been suggested that this language was inserted to enable the Congress of the United States—that is the Federal Government—to preserve itself in time of emergency. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, that in time of stress, when the existence of a nation is at stake, the people of that nation do those things that are necessary and vital to protect themselves, and to preserve their integrity as a nation, without regard to the limitations of a written constitution.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the Senate should release the supervisory control of elections and the House of Representatives should retain it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. None whatever.

Mr. KOPP. Then why is this not made at least symmetrical in that respect, and why not strike out the whole provision?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Simply because it would not be appropriate in this connection. We are now dealing with the popular election of Senators only, but there is no reason why in the proper manner and at the proper time the same power of control should not be extended to the States in respect of the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there is no occasion to retain the present language of the Constitution, on the ground that it is necessary for the vital existence of the Republic, then we ought not to retain in our organic law any language which is not susceptible of definite ascertainment and positive meaning.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If we do not know what the language means, and the purpose is to correct the Constitution in that respect, why not at the same time strike out the same provision in reference to the election of Members of this House?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Inasmuch as this amendment relates to the election of Senators, the language used is pertinent and germane, but it would be inappropriate in this connection to undertake to strike out the provision of the Constitution relating to the control of Congress over the election of Members of the House. Personally I have no objection to such action being taken, and would be glad to see it done at the proper time. I hope this answers the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask two minutes more of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. So many gentlemen are asking for time, Mr. Speaker, that I will have to limit the gentleman to one minute.

Mr. SAUNDERS. So many questions have been asked me, that the answers have consumed a large portion of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give the gentleman from Virginia two minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that that which is unknown is always terrifying, and to retain in a written instrument language which does not convey a precise and definite authority is to retain that which will be a lurking element of danger. In the history of our Government, in all our times of stress, the time has never yet arrived when the statesmen of the country have been able to ascertain what this language means, or to enact any legislation under its authority. Looking down the vista of time, I can not see that the retention of this provision in the organic law in relation to the election of Senators is in any wise necessary for the preservation of our liberties, or rights, or for the promotion of the national safety.

For what purpose, may I ask those gentlemen who insist upon its retention—for what purpose should this vague and indefinite power of control over State elections, be retained in the hands of Congress? There is no question of partisan politics involved. If the Constitution, is changed in this respect, the change will enlarge the power of all the States alike. It will not afford an exclusive, or dangerous power to any section of the United States.

There is no portion of our common country that is interested in the retention of this indefinite power by Congress. This fact I call to the attention of the gentlemen who profess to favor the general principle of popular election of Senators but oppose the present bill, merely because one of its provisions gives to the States a power which they should have had from the

beginning. They are ready to imperil the principle which they profess to be willing to support, on a ground which is palpably flimsy and unsubstantial. No gentleman in this debate has undertaken to define, or to declare the extent of the power which it is supposed that Congress now enjoys over the time and manner of holding elections to elect the Members of this House. The Congress of the United States to-day enjoys no control over the place of holding the elections. It possesses a power, over the time and manner only, which no expositor of the Constitution has ever been able to fix in any precise terms. This bill should pass in the form in which it was reported. The people have demanded this reform, and the enactment of this law in terms that can not be misunderstood, and the response to that demand should be its passage by a unanimous vote of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I think gentlemen on that side of the aisle are alarming themselves unduly over the effect of the modification of the paragraph of the Constitution to which so much reference has been made. I frankly state that I should not vote against this proposition if the proposed modification was not contained in the resolution; but I do prefer that it should be contained therein. And what, in common reason, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, can be the objection to retaining it? What is this resolution itself? It is but the expression of a confidence in the judgment, the wisdom, and the patriotism of the people of the States. If the people can be trusted to elect their Senators, may they not be trusted to regulate the manner and the time of choosing the Senators?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in addressing the Chamber this morning, referred to what he himself declared to be an extreme case, that of a State seceding, and asked how the Federal Government could preserve and perpetuate its organization under such a condition as that. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when many States seceded. The Federal Government at that time possessed this power. Did it preserve its power and its prestige by regulating the election of Senators in the States under the power that it then possessed? Oh, no; it preserved its power and its prestige by force and arms, just as it will have to do again should such a condition arise. The leaving of that power in the Congress of the United States will not aid in preserving the power of the Government under such conditions as that. It is consistent with the thought that underlies this amendment, in that it is adding to the power of the people of the States; and, as I have said, being not only willing but anxious to give to the people of the States the power which they demand, of acting directly upon those who shall represent the States in the coordinate legislative branch of the Government, I am willing to go still further and say that if they are capable of doing that they certainly are capable of dealing patriotically and wisely with the question of the manner and the time of choosing those officers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan if he will consume the balance of his time? As far as I know, there will be only one more speaker on this side.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the Chair state how much time we have left on each side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 47 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. UTTER].

Mr. UTTER. Mr. Speaker, I hardly expected that the necessity would arise to-day to defend Rhode Island, and I am glad to say that Rhode Island does not need any defense. When the opportunity arises for this House to consider Rhode Island under the state of the Union, Rhode Island will be found making a favorable report. [Applause.] I do think it is proper for me to say, however, that though I have been a resident of the State of Rhode Island for half a century, and my colleague from that State [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] has been a resident of the State for a little less than four years, I doubt if he is any more ready to leave the State to-day than I am. Indeed, both of us intend to stay. [Applause.]

The resolution which we have before us to-day provides for two things. This Congress has put upon it two duties. The first is the duty of providing a way by which the people can express their opinions in amending their Constitution; the second is the duty of doing that in such a form that the people can pass upon that amendment in a clear and understanding manner.

This resolution proposes two things: The first is open and frank; it proposes to give to the people of the various States

the right to elect their Senators by direct vote. It proposes, in the second place, a thing that is not open, a thing that is not frank, and that is to change the Constitution in such a way as to rob Congress of the right to protect itself. [Applause.]

I have heard nothing here on either side of criticism of the first open and frank proposition. Members on both sides, almost unanimously, have stated that they believed in the election of United States Senators by the people. The only criticism that has come has been criticism of submitting to the people so important a change in such a manner that they can not pass upon one change without also passing upon another.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening as a new Member, and I have been pleased by the remarks made by members of the majority that they wanted to play fair. If you want to play fair as a body, play fair by placing before the people the resolution of amendment in such a form that they can understand it and vote on the prime purpose, and not be held back by a secondary amendment. I therefore ask you to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young], and having accepted the amendment to ratify the resolution and ratify it practically unanimously. As the gentleman from Illinois has well said, while the people of the United States have plainly asked for the privilege of electing Senators by the votes of the people of the several States, they have not and will not demand that the Senate and the House of Representatives yield their power to protect themselves. Therefore, in order to protect ourselves as we legislate for the great American people, we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and then unanimously pass the constitutional amendment asked for by the people. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Michigan understands that there is but one more speech to be made on this side?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I so understood the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I expected to yield to a gentleman whom I supposed had changed his mind. I now understand differently, and I will yield to him now.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Very well.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Bartlett].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to add anything to this discussion. I am in favor of the resolution as it comes from the committee. It is the same resolution that has been passed by this House and which for three times the House has almost unanimously voted, both Republican and Democratic, when the House was overwhelmingly Republican. It is the same resolution that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported, word for word, unanimously at the last session. It is the same resolution—in fact, it contains the same language—that would have passed the Senate and been now the law upon the statute book—submitting to the people of the United States the great change in our Constitution which the people have demanded, which the Democratic Party in its platform and pledges have for years demanded—had not the enemies of the resolution in the United States Senate injected into the resolution an amendment which is now offered on the floor of this House to accomplish the same purpose, the defeat of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if we can submit to the people of the States of this Union this resolution, amended as is proposed, we take away from them the right to prescribe the qualifications of voters in the election of Senators and destroy the form of government that was intended by the fathers—a union of States, and not a consolidated confederate empire, simply an empire with provinces. Those of us who believe in local self-government ought not to be asked to give into the hands of Congress expressly the power to invade the States and regulate the franchises of their citizens and the manner of holding their elections.

While I heartily approve of the election of United States Senators by the people, I can not support the proposition that Congress shall have the power to regulate and supervise these elections in the States; and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan shall be adopted I can not support the resolution.

I have stated that the amendment offered here is the same as that proposed in the Senate. I find it is the exact amendment which, being adopted in the Senate, accomplished the defeat of the resolution in the Senate at the last session, which was as follows:

Senate joint resolution 134.

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. SUTHERLAND to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, viz:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "vacancy," strike out the words "and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senator."

And on page 2 strike out, in lines 9, 10, and 11, the words "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

I recall that there have been times, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States has endeavored, with reference to the election of Representatives in Congress and other matters that affected certain sections of this country, to pass stringent, violent, and forceful laws. In many cases it took the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to decide that those laws were unconstitutional, and the question as to whether Congress can invade the States and regulate the election even of Representatives is one of some doubt, because the cases decided by the Supreme Court were not decided by a unanimous court, but by a bare majority of the court. In a case to which I desire to allude, and which I hold in my hand, the Supreme Court decided that the State of Michigan had a right to prescribe the manner of holding the election for electors for President. The State of Michigan prescribed for this election of electors for President by congressional districts.

That was the case of *McPherson v. Blocker* (146 U. S. Repts., p. 1), in which the court decided:

Under the Constitution the legislatures of the several States have exclusive power to direct the manner in which the electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed.

Such appointment may be made by the legislatures directly or by popular vote in districts or by general ticket, as may be provided by the legislatures.

In the same case, and in many others, cited in this case, the court decides that the right to vote in the States comes from the States; and that the right to vote intended to be protected by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitutions of the States.

Surely, if we can leave to the States the right to determine who shall vote for the Chief Executive, we can and should not depart from that safe and sound constitutional rule in the election of Senators. The great end in view sought to be obtained by this resolution, and which has been so constantly demanded by the people, is not that the Congress shall regulate the election of Senators by invading the rights of the States and local self-government, but that the qualified voters of the States, qualified as such by the laws and requirements prescribed by the State legislatures, shall have the right to choose directly United States Senators, and that power shall be no longer lodged in the legislatures of the States.

Quoting from Mr. Jefferson:

The Senate was intended as a check on the will of the Representatives when too hasty; they are not only that, but completely so on the will of the people also; and in my opinion are heaping coals of fire not only on their persons, but on their body as a branch of the legislature. It seems that the opinion is fairly launched into public that they should be placed under the control of a more frequent recurrence to the will of their constituents. This seems requisite to complete the experiment, whether they do more harm or good. Mischief may be done negatively as well as positively. Of this the Senate has furnished many proofs.

I do not know whether this was true at the time when Mr. Jefferson wrote these words, but we do know that in more recent years the action of the Senate on many important questions has been such that the demand has constantly grown that the manner of electing United States Senators shall be changed. And I trust that the day is not far distant when this demand of the people shall be complied with. The passage of this resolution by Congress will bring to the people a realization of their hopes, so long deferred. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, it was my purpose to offer an amendment to line 4, page 2, to insert after the word "the" the following words, "direct vote of the"; but I yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who contemplates offering some amendments, one of which will cover the point I have in view. I shall take this opportunity, however, to say that the people of the district I have the honor to represent—Scranton, Pa., and Lackawanna County—are very generally in favor of United States Senators being elected by the direct votes of the people, and, in accordance with their wishes and my own convictions, I shall cheerfully vote in favor of an amendment to the Constitution to give the people that privilege.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me from the discussion this afternoon that there is here more or less misapprehension as to the law; and, with due deference to the distinguished gentlemen who entertain views different from my own, I desire to state the law as I understand it. The right to vote is not a Federal right. It does not come from the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution each State has always had the sole power to prescribe the qualifications of

its electors. The pending amendment leaves this power unchanged, and under it the States would still have the right to say what shall be the qualifications of those who are to vote for United States Senators. Those qualifications this amendment prescribes shall be the qualifications of electors for the lower branch of the respective State legislatures.

All that the Federal Constitution does by the fifteenth amendment, to which reference has been frequently made, is to guarantee that a certain kind of discrimination therein specified shall not be practiced by the States. The right of suffrage itself, the qualifications of electors, comes from the State statute. Here is the fifteenth amendment:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Now, if the proposed amendment shall become a part of the Constitution, then when a State has fixed the qualifications of the citizens who can vote for members of the lower branch of the State legislature, those citizens will be the persons who can vote for United States Senators. If any State should pass a law declaring that white citizens could vote for United States Senators, but that colored citizens could not, the Supreme Court, of course, would pronounce such a law unconstitutional.

While I would prefer that this amendment, in order that it might have been insured passage by the requisite number of States, should not contain the provision it does contain nullifying part of paragraph 4 of section 1, nevertheless I am unable to see such possible harm to come as has been talked about so frequently and so forcefully here to-day. There is now a Federal statute which would punish any conspiracy of election commissioners or other persons in a State who should undertake, in violation of the fifteenth amendment, to deprive qualified electors of the State of their right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not time to amplify this.

There is another phase of the question about which I wish to say a word. I hope gentlemen appreciate my pleasure on hearing distinguished Republicans rise on this floor to-day and in exultant tones proclaim that there is unanimity among Republicans everywhere as to the wisdom of having United States Senators elected by the people. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not always so. I had the honor on behalf of the State of Wisconsin in the Republican national convention of 1903 to present a plank calling for the election of United States Senators by the people. It received 114 votes out of a total of more than 900. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I remember that a distinguished Republican, the chairman of the committee on resolutions, Mr. Hopkins, then United States Senator from the State of Illinois, denounced that plank and rejoiced when Republicans repudiated it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I cite this at this time only to remind the House that, in the language of the Rev. John Jasper, of Richmond, Va., "The world do move." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. COOPER. I would like a minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. In order to have this matter fully, fairly, and freely discussed, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. COOPER. I am under very great obligations to the gentleman from Missouri. I appreciate the disinterestedness of his motives. [Laughter and applause.] Not for the world would he see any trouble on this side of the Chamber! [Laughter and applause.] But I shall not say another word about the Chicago convention. [Laughter.] Nor shall I proceed any further to elaborate upon the law—

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I do.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the resolution as proposed by the majority, if it should be submitted to the people of the several States and receive their approval, would not nullify a portion of the fifteenth amendment to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. COOPER. I do not at all think so.

Mr. HAYES. The last expression of the popular will, the gentleman thinks, would not control?

Mr. COOPER. It would not nullify any part of the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. HAYES. I think it would.

Mr. COOPER. Just a moment. My contention is this: That the right guaranteed to every voter in the United States by the Constitution of the United States is that the State of which he is a citizen shall not discriminate against him as a voter on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. There is nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent a State from fixing a property qualification for the suffrage and saying that no man not possessed of \$50,000 worth of property should have the right to vote. No State ought to pass a law of that kind; but any State might pass such a law unless its own State constitution would prevent. The Federal Constitution would permit the State of the distinguished gentleman from California to enact a statute providing that only citizens worth \$50,000 might vote, but thereupon the fifteenth amendment would guarantee every citizen of that State worth \$50,000 the right to vote whether he were white or colored.

The qualifications of electors are fixed by the State statutes, and the Constitution guarantees, let me repeat, that there shall be no discrimination between citizen voters because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This right being guaranteed by the Constitution, the United States, as a sovereign Nation, has the power to pass a law which shall protect that right and punish those who violate it. Congress has already enacted such a law—section 5508 of the Revised Statutes:

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise and enjoyment of any right or privilege granted to him by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, etc., * * * he shall be punished, etc.

That is broad enough to cover violations of the provisions of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendments. It could be made specifically to cover cases coming under the fifteenth amendment. And it could be amended—

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment. Now, there is in this connection another subject to which we as Republicans ought to direct our attention. As a Republican born and bred, reared in a Republican atmosphere, coming from among a people who conducted stations of the underground railroad to help men and women to liberty, I greatly deplore the fact that in certain portions of the Republic citizens are disfranchised by statute practically, and only because of their color. Every disfranchisement, as I understand it, is under a statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. Under the constitution of the State.

Mr. COOPER. Under the constitution of the State, and those statutes have been taken—the "grandfather" statute and others—to the Supreme Court of the United States and declared to be constitutional.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. There are a good many phases of this question. But I do not believe—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES]?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment. As I said, this resolution would have been more certain of receiving the support of the requisite number of States if it had been drawn somewhat differently, but if it should pass in this form I do not believe that the rights of any citizen would be jeopardized. And the men who believe in the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people ought not to jeopardize the necessary two-thirds vote by voting against the resolution in its original form if it becomes necessary to vote upon that naked proposition. There are good men here who believe the resolution as presented is dangerous; but there are bad men, cunning men throughout the country who want this resolution defeated at all hazards. [Applause.] No mere technicality conjured up here should suffice to defeat a thing so vital to the welfare of the Republic.

One of the gentlemen said that when our forefathers enacted the Constitution conditions were not as they are to-day. That is true. There is to-day such a concentration of wealth and power—often of dangerously corrupting influences—around State legislatures as our forefathers never dreamed of, as the world never imagined until within the last 40 years. Therefore this amendment ought to pass, and will pass, in some form or other, I sincerely hope. I shall vote for the amendment proposed, and if that does not pass then I shall vote for the original resolution.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has not failed to discriminate between the amendment to the Constitution which controls the Congress of the United States and the

statute passed by Congress which a majority of both Houses may repeal at any time?

Mr. COOPER. Not at all. And the gentleman fails to see the point which I attempted to make, which is, that this amendment leaves with the States the right to fix the qualifications of the electors.

Mr. HAYES. Surely; but it takes away from the Congress of the United States the right to supervise the election of Senators and to regulate the manner in which they shall be elected, which it has at present under the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. We have not the right to-day to fix the qualifications of electors. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. We have never had that right under the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Congress never had the right to fix the qualifications of the electors of the States. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 4, by inserting after the word "by" the following: "A direct vote of."

Amend page 2, lines 7 and 8, by striking out the word "legislatures" and inserting the word "legislature."

Amend page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "that the legislature of any State may empower," and on line 16, by striking out the word "to" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Amend on page 2, line 18, by striking out the words "so" and "as."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this House has on a number of occasions in the past passed a joint resolution providing for a direct vote on the election of Senators. So far as I remember, I have never voted for that resolution. I shall not vote for this resolution.

I am not prepared to say whether, in my own judgment, Senators should be elected by a direct vote or by the method now provided by the Constitution. But I think I am able to see far enough into the future to see that if it shall be provided that Senators shall be elected by a direct vote of the people of the various States it is but the beginning of the end of State sovereignty, of the sovereign rights of a State, or the powers of a State, as they now exist, over local matters.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] a moment ago complained of the constitution and laws of his State, which give to one district with a small population the same representation in the senate of that State that the city of Providence has, with a population of more than 200,000. So long as we have maintained the principle that the Senators were delegates of the State, elected by the legislatures of the State, we could well claim that each State should have the same representation.

But the very reason that causes the gentleman from Rhode Island to refer with invective to the laws of his State which take away equal representation will, in the course of a few years, when the Senators are elected by the States by direct vote of the people, cause the great State of New York, the great State of Illinois, aye, the people of the great country in which we live, to say, "There is no reason why a man in Rhode Island voting for a United States Senator should be the equal of 20 men in the State of New York."

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will not yield at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. MANN. It is the logic of events, Mr. Speaker, which controls us in the long run. And there is nothing so inexorable as the logic of events. We think now that if we change the method of electing Senators and provide that they shall be elected by a direct vote of the people we do not change the theory of the Constitution. Aye, but we do, and when but a short time goes on—it may be shorter or longer—the people will say that it is unfair to have rotten boroughs in States, as the gentleman from Rhode Island would say they have rotten boroughs in Rhode Island. For many years in England members of Parliament were elected from rotten boroughs, without population to speak of, but having the same power and the same influence that those members had who came from great centers of population, representing great numbers of people.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I am yet undecided in my own mind as to how far the present tendency of events ought to proceed in the abolition of the powers and the rights of the States.

Under the commerce clause of the Constitution we have already largely deprived the States of their powers, and as in business we meet the commercial affairs of the country, we are

constantly importuned on every side to add to the powers of the General Government and to take away the powers of the local governments. I do not undertake to say which is the proper course, but so long as I have been in this legislative body I have endeavored to maintain the rights of the States as originally contemplated, believing that if the time came when State lines should be practically abolished, it ought to be done with knowledge and by the direct representation and mandate of the people, instead of being done indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest benefits which the citizens of our country enjoy is the right of local self-government. I do not wish to be a party in any degree to the taking away from the people of the right of local self-government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to discuss the merits of this proposition to any extent, forced upon us in the way that it has been, without a fair chance to consider it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me at present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. MANN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman later. When I say that this proposition has been forced upon us in the way that it has been, without a fair chance to consider it, I do not mean merely the opportunity to talk about it on the floor of the House. I mean the opportunity to offer amendments, the chance to really consider the proposition. In the last Congress the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], the colleague of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], introduced a resolution on this subject. There had been many resolutions passed before it. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, in the Fifty-fifth Congress, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, in the Fifty-seventh Congress a resolution had been passed providing for the direct election of Senators. A resolution similar to those four which had previously passed was introduced in the last Congress by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] and reported favorably from the committee, though never passed through the House. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] introduced on April 4, the first day of this session, a resolution quite similar to the one which had been four times passed and which, one other time, had been introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] and reported into the House; but the resolution as it comes before us for action, without a chance to give it consideration, is an entirely different one.

I propose to call attention to some of the particular things in the resolution now pending. Gentlemen may say that the criticism I make is a carping criticism. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that the Constitution of the United States was sufficiently important to consider both the merits and the form of the amendments which might be adopted to it. It has always seemed to me that Congress might even consider rhetoric and grammar when adding an amendment to the Constitution.

When we remember that there have been so few amendments added in all the many years of the existence of our Constitution, it has seemed to me that we might take sufficient time at least to put an amendment in proper grammatical and rhetorical shape. Considering the fact that there have been only three amendments added to the Constitution in more than 100 years, I think we might take sufficient time to say what we mean in proper grammatical form, so that one who runs may read and understand.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to say—

Mr. MANN. I will permit the gentleman to say anything in the way of a question. Otherwise I hope he will wait until I get further along.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will not ask the gentleman a question if he does not want me to, but will reserve it until later.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman from Illinois to say that if we were to elect Senators by the people there would be great danger of the large States overriding the smaller States?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I suppose the gentleman proposes to read me a constitutional provision that that can not be done.

Mr. COOPER. I wish simply to remind—

Mr. MANN. I am familiar with the Constitution on the subject.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that there is a sufficient answer to the gentleman. I ask him if he does not think this answers it?

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and that provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment; and when the tendency runs, as it will run, so strong against the gross injustice of permitting—

Mr. COOPER. That particular provision is not subject to amendment, and it is the only one in the Constitution that is not. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken; that provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment. Every provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment. That provision itself must first be amended before you can deprive a State of its equal rights in the Senate; but when that provision has been amended, as it will be some day, then they will make the division among the States equitable, because in the end it is absolutely unfair that the State of Delaware should have 2 Senators in the United States Senate and 1 Representative on the floor of the House and the great State of New York should have, as it is now proposed, 40 Members of the House and only 2 Senators.

What is there in that to carry out the will of the people? Gentlemen talk about obeying the will of the people. If the will of the people is to be executed, then the people must have the chance to elect their Representatives upon equal terms, and the logic is as inevitable as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCALL. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANN. I will yield.

Mr. McCALL. In reference to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has said, if the States refuse to yield their representation, would it be possible to amend the Constitution, taking all the power away from the Senate?

Mr. MANN. You can amend the Constitution in any way. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the amusing things, it seems to me, in reference to this amendment is, in the first place, the whole theory of the proposed amendment is that the legislatures of the States can not be trusted. That is the whole theory of the amendment—that the legislatures of the different States can not be trusted. The Constitution provides that an amendment may be ratified by the legislatures or by conventions called in the States. And yet the distinguished gentleman from Missouri seeks to cast odium, as it would be by the amendment, on the legislatures, rejecting the right of a State to determine whether it shall ratify this amendment by convention, but requires that it shall be left wholly to the legislature. If he has such a wonderful belief in the rights of the people as expressed by direct vote, why has it not been left in a way that the State may elect conventions to pass upon this resolution?

It provides further, in reference to legislatures, that the legislature may or it may not empower the executive to fill vacancies temporarily. No requirement has been carried in all resolutions heretofore that the executive shall make an appointment to fill vacancies. It proposes to leave to the legislature that authority. In addition to that, stating on the one hand that the legislature is unworthy of trust to elect United States Senators, it proposes to say that the legislature is so worthy that it shall determine as to the time and places and manner of holding elections, and placing the legislature above Congress. On the one side this resolution says that the legislature is unworthy of confidence, and on the other that it is worthy of more confidence than Congress itself. That is logic for you. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen all the afternoon have been talking about election of Senators by direct vote of the people. The resolutions which have heretofore passed this body, the resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress, provided—

That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by the direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years.

"Elected by the direct vote of the people thereof." Anybody can understand what that means. Anybody knows what that says, and it says that they shall be elected by a direct vote of the people. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] this morning announced that there would be no amendments to this resolution of his—no dotting of "i's" or crossing of "t's"; he had perfected it and did not propose to have it amended.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I want to say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Missouri said nothing of the kind, but said just the contrary, and stated that opportunity would be permitted to offer amendments.

Mr. MANN. To present amendments; yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And I did say that I wanted to vote every one of them down.

Mr. MANN. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. This resolution—

Mr. MANN. Oh, do not take so much of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, the gentleman ought not to refer to me unless he talks the facts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the time. I am not the one who limited it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman's friend did.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. The gentleman from Missouri limited the time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not want to get into a controversy with the gentleman; but that is not correct, because debate was limited by consent of the House.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is true.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Did I not ask for the longest limit of time desired on that side?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I suggested that we have more than one day's debate on the proposition.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman has always been opposed to this measure, and I did not pay very much respect to his wishes in the matter.

Mr. MANN. That is all right; but do not take my time or bother me now.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am not going to bother the gentleman. I want only to express my opinion.

Mr. MANN. I do not wonder that the gentleman gets restive when his resolution is under consideration.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. A Republican resolution, as I have already told the gentleman a hundred times, but I am supporting it.

Mr. MANN. Well, it is quite likely that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the great Committee on the Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, seeking for an opportunity to make fame for himself—running around and hunting for a form—it is very likely that he has picked up some Republican thunder. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] We have learned before this that that which we have discarded that side of the House joyfully embraces as something good and new. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I prefer to discuss the resolution. The gentleman has plenty of time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give the gentleman as much time as I consume of his.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will wait until I finish, I will be very much obliged.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the gentleman does not want me to ask him a question when it is proper—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I would be very glad to let the gentleman ask me a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly; I always yield in the end, though I prefer to get through.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has consumed more time now than it would take to ask the question. He does not want me to ask him any question.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I will permit the gentleman to ask me a question. What is it?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No; I will not ask any question. I am getting tired of that display, and I will get along without it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I learned long ago when I was in control of a bill to keep my temper. Gentlemen on that side of the House will have that lesson to learn in the course of time.

The gentleman has left out the direct vote of the people. What more? The resolution provides:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Plural! How many legislatures does a State have, for God's sake? [Laughter and applause on Republican side.] Oh, no; that is not the fault of the printer, as some gentleman near me suggests. That is the fault of the gentleman who introduced the resolution. The resolution which formerly passed the House had the correct expression, providing that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of

the most numerous branch of the legislature thereof, or of that State, but the gentleman from Missouri—I will apologize to the gentleman—I do not think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is the one who made the discovery, for it is quite likely, and I agree with him, that that was in the bill as it was presented in the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol. But if my friend from Missouri had watched that distinguished body as closely as I have, he would have learned before this that it is not safe to rely on other legislative bodies either as to substance or as to form.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It depends on who composed the body.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has this side of the House now. Who composed the body I do not undertake to say. It is a fine-looking body of men, I will say, whom I see upon that side of the House, but their grammar is a little off. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

Then it says:

When vacancies happen—

When "vacancies" happen—

In the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MANN. I would ask for five minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman whatever time I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I will not want to take so much time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield whatever of that time the gentleman desires.

Mr. MANN. If I were writing that language I should have written—

When a vacancy happens in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue a writ of election to fill such vacancy.

The statutes of the United States provide that when the plural or singular number is used in the statutes it shall apply to the other when applicable, and that often corrects mistakes like this of using the plural instead of the singular, but the statutes do not govern in the construction of the Constitution of the United States, and one would think that after being out, as they say, for 16 years they would discover that when they wished to say a vacancy they would say a vacancy instead of vacancies. There is vacancy enough now on that side without making it plural. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I prefer not; the gentleman has time. Now, I do not wish to be carping, but here is a constitutional amendment, and the last provision is—

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

The first principle of language is to reduce the number of words to express the thought to as few as possible. That is a principle which I know, though I do not always follow it.

Mr. JAMES. It does not apply to speeches, does it?

Mr. MANN. The provision ought to be—

This amendment shall not be construed to affect the election or term of any Senator.

And if my friend from Missouri was writing it and had his attention called to it, he would agree to it; but, of course, now he will feel compelled to stand by the provision. Mr. Speaker, but a few words more. In the first part the joint resolution provides, among other things, that—

In lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators.

Think for a moment of the rhetorical expression of stating that it shall be "in lieu of all" of the paragraph, but really in lieu of only a part of it; but coming to the gist of it, what authority has Congress to say what part of the Constitution an amendment is "in lieu of"? The amendment, when it is agreed to by three-fourths of the States and becomes a part of the Constitution, is for the courts to determine as to its meaning. This part of the resolution is no part of the amendment. We may legislate here and say that a certain amendment is in place of the whole Constitution, but that is not before the legislatures of the States which ratify the amendment; but when the amendment is ratified it speaks for itself, and the courts, not Congress, will construe the part of the Constitution it is in lieu of. But the purpose of that, and that is the first time the provision in that form has appeared in any of these resolutions, the purpose of that resolution is to take out of the Constitution the power which Congress would otherwise have when it so desired to

regulate the time and manner of holding elections for Senators. Ever since the Government was organized Congress has had the power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

We have had the power to regulate the time and manner of conducting the election of Senators, not the place, because the place was supposed to be within the power of the State to fix as being the capital of the State, and it was not designed to give Congress the power to fix the capital of the State.

Now, under this amendment, as I read it, though there is some doubt, Congress will still have the power to regulate the time, and place, and manner, for holding elections for Members of Congress. Why is it proposed that Congress shall not have the same power over the election of Senators by the same electorate—probably at the same time? It ought to be. We have so provided in course of time that we have required, in effect, the election of electors at a fixed time, in fact, and their meeting at the same time. Through the power of Congress to regulate the election of Representatives, and the fear that that power might be exercised in course of time, most of the States have fixed their fall elections for Members of Congress at the same time. Senators ought to be elected at the same election that Members of the House are, and yet it is proposed to take away from Congress the power to control these elections and to place it absolutely in the hands of the States.

It is true that Congress has not exercised the power, but it often happens that when a superior body possesses a power it is not necessary to exercise it, because the inferior body acts with fairness and justice. Under this provision of the Constitution, if made as it stands in the resolution, Utah, Delaware, Rhode Island, Illinois, or Indiana, or New York, or any State in the Union, may make provisions which have never yet been heard of as to the election of Senators. I contend that under the wording of the amendment, as it now stands, the election of Senators by the people, that it does not require a direct vote of the people. If we had a central body to be composed of delegates to be elected from various subordinate bodies, it would often be the case that those delegates would be appointed by the executive committee of the lower body. No one would suppose from reading the rules of this House that it meant that the committees were to be elected, possibly, by ballot.

There is no provision here that Senators shall be elected by a ballot or by a vote even. We elect committees by resolution, not by ballot, and under this provision, if it should be put into the Constitution, there will come a time when some of the States will find other methods of electing Senators than by a direct vote of the people; and, if history should repeat itself, there would come times when from some of the Southern States Senators would be elected without a direct vote. Under this provision, in the carpetbag days of the South, some of the gentlemen in control of those States would have claimed that they had elected a Senator by the people if the governor issued a commission, without anything further. And remember that, under this, Congress has no control. I appeal to the gentlemen in power on that side of the House, that if you propose to amend the Constitution in this regard now before it comes up for construction, make it plain, so that those who come after may know what it means without court, judicial, or war proceedings.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to yield me two minutes in which to reply to one question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I stated a while ago to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] that after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] delivered his speech there would be only one other speech on this side.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think I have a little time remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan, and to the gentleman from Missouri also, that I do not intend to make a speech, but I do think that the provision of the Constitution of the United States, one construction of which I gave, and which was contradicted point-blank by the gentleman from Illinois, ought to be read to the House, and I just ask for two minutes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; certainly, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois prophesied that the large States would force an amendment depriving the smaller States of their equal rights in the Senate. I said that the large States could not force upon a smaller State a constitutional amendment to deprive it of its equal suffrage in the Senate except with the consent of the smaller State. With this the gentleman from Illinois did not agree.

Here is Article V of the Constitution:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article, and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

[Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I read that very carefully before I made my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there will be only one more speech made on this side in concluding this debate. I desire to use three or four minutes, if I may do so with propriety, in order to answer some things which were said here, about which I was not permitted to interrogate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] while he was on the floor.

It is a great misfortune, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who delivered that magnificent lecture to the House this evening had not lived in olden times and in his own happy style of English framed the Constitution of the United States in language so perfect that even a genius like himself would not dare attack it. [Laughter.] But he did not, and therefore we have got to try to get along in some old way with the Constitution which was handed down to us by those distinguished men who did frame it as best they could. [Laughter.]

The gentleman here this evening makes a great speech in behalf of the rights of the people and the rights of the States and the rights of the Constitution, and would lead us to believe that he is probably reluctant in opposing this measure because of the numerous and clerical grammatical errors to which he has called the attention of the House in a jocular and very instructive speech. [Laughter.]

The gentleman lauds and presents as practically perfect and free from criticism, even at his hands, the resolution offered in the last Congress by my distinguished colleague, Mr. LLOYD. But the gentleman will bear with me when I say this, that when the committee, at that time presided over by a distinguished Republican from West Virginia, Mr. Gaines, brought in a report and recommended to this House that that resolution should pass the gentleman from Illinois arose in his place and objected to the passage of the resolution which he to-day tells us is absolutely perfect, because of a misprint in the Government Printing Office of one word—the addition of an “s.” Is not that true? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I did not say it was perfect.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman objected to it for the reason that it contained an “s” when there ought not to have been one, and that was the only objection made.

Mr. MANN. I objected to it when I discovered an “s” on the word “amendment,” and that was enough to put me on guard as to the rest of the language.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; and the gentleman is “on guard” and has been for some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. And will be for some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will not discuss that. Of course what I am now going to say has no application on earth, Mr. Speaker, but I read a long time ago in some poetry—I think Pope's incomparable poems; no; it was in Cowper—a couplet that sometimes forces itself into my mind. When I see a gentleman laboring so arduously and earnestly, apparently, for public welfare and yet one who is never able to find anything on earth quite good enough for him to take at the command of the people, sometimes I can not help, to save my soul, having that couplet flash through my mind. The poet wrote:

With smooth dissimulation skilled, to grace
A devil's purpose with an angel's face.

[Laughter.]

It has no application here, and I would not have quoted the language if it had not been that the gentleman has criticized my grammar, and I wanted him to understand that if I do not know all about grammar, I do know some things about the application of poetry. [Laughter.]

But the gentleman said that this resolution is woefully bad because it reads:

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies—

And he criticizes that word “happen” as an error.

But the gentleman forgets that this old Constitution which he is guarding so sacredly from the amendments which the

people have been pleading for for 40 years uses that identical language:

When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies—

Word for word the language in the resolution now pending before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He forgets also that in the second clause of the second paragraph in the Constitution the identical language is found which is found in this resolution, where it says:

And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—

Exactly what we have here, except—

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, I know you find a surplus “s,” and as long as the gentleman is on guard he will always find the “s” in all reform measures, and an “s” is such an obstacle that that great leader of Republicanism in the city of Chicago can not get over it.

But let me say to you, sir, if conditions had existed 130 years ago that exist to-day those distinguished patriots of this country never would have written into the Constitution some of its yet cherished provisions. At that time the human mind had never been traduced by a thought so foul as that a great people would ever stoop to such practices as we learn are sometimes found in great States and in the legislatures of those States. I heard the gentleman mention the State of Illinois awhile ago, and I thought, “What a great State it is; in fact, it has made more history in the last six months than the Southern Confederacy made in four years.” [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Illinois made more history in the four years of the Civil War than the Southern Confederacy did.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I hope I will have no interruptions. I did not intend to consume any time. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of embarrassment that I undertake to close this debate on this very important subject, for I speak without any preparation and without previous determination. I shall not waste much of the 15 minutes allowed me in answer to the criticisms of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the phraseology of this bill. Some of these criticisms have already been answered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]; but it may not be amiss to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois again to the fact that an accurate and careful reading of the Constitution itself might have saved him from the mistake of one of his criticisms. He complained that while much has been said here of the direct vote of the people, yet when we framed the terms of the resolution we provided only that “the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof.” Had he remembered—because he has undoubtedly read—the second section of Article I of the Constitution, he would have remembered that it is in this language:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

Nothing is said there of the direct vote, though Representatives are thus elected, and there is no more necessity for it here than there.

But I desire to come to the real propositions that are here involved. It is perhaps unnecessary at this late day to say anything as to the merits of the major proposition; and yet it may not be amiss to note with reference to the eulogy of the gentleman's party that the only voices that have been raised against the major proposition to elect Senators by direct vote of the people have been Republican. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No Democrat on this floor has criticized that proposition. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is peculiarly solicitous for State sovereignty and State rights, and he assumes that because you provide a different method of electing Senators you have struck a deathblow to State sovereignty. I have never been able to follow that logic. As pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], you can not change, without the consent of each State, the equal representation of the States in the Senate, and simply changing the method of electing Senators does not in the slightest degree do away with the power of the States themselves as sovereignties.

Of course, if you accept the gentleman's premise, that one amendment of the Constitution necessarily means untold amendments to the Constitution, why, then, that conclusion of his, or any other conclusion, would be entirely logical. But that has not been the history of amendments to the Constitution, and there is nothing now to warrant the assumption.

But the question that is really interesting this House, and the question that I desire to come to, is not the major proposition, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, but it is that proposition involved in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan, as to whether we should not have in the Constitution, as it is proposed to be amended, the power in the Federal Government to control the election of United States Senators. That is the real question at issue here.

Now, if it were possible, as suggested repeatedly by the gentlemen on this side, to provide for direct vote of Senators by the people without changing the present power that exists in the Congress of the United States relative to the election of Senators, I would agree that it was highly improper to bring into this question another question about which there is such a division of opinion. But bear in mind this basic fact, that the very moment that you provide by constitutional amendment that Senators shall be elected by direct vote of the people instead of by the legislatures of the States, that moment, unless you make further provision, you have enlarged the power of the Government of the United States over the election of Senators of the United States.

I repeat, that the moment you change the form of the election from that by the legislature to that by direct vote of the people, that moment you have enlarged the power of the Federal Government over such elections. The power that exists to-day under the Constitution as to the election of Senators and Representatives, while in the same language, is not, in a practical real sense, the same power.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question only.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will recollect that the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress, and which was reported and which I have offered as a substitute, contains no reference to section 4, Article I. Would the gentleman hold that that resolution extended the power of the Federal Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply answer that it is not material as to what was provided in any former resolution. The material thing is what we shall provide in this amendment. I have not time in the 15 minutes to discuss the various bills that have been introduced. I say to you, in my judgment, that if you are not to enlarge the power of the Federal Government you must add something besides the simple provision as to the method of electing Senators.

The power of Congress over elections for Representatives in Congress is practically complete. While Congress may not prescribe the qualification of voters, and while that right is left entirely with the States, subject only to the provisions of the fifteenth amendment, yet Congress can, by regulating the "manner" of holding these elections, give to the Federal Government complete control, as it actually did during the reconstruction period. As to election of Senators, Congress can now give to the Federal Government no such powers. Practically speaking, its power over their election is so slight as to be negligible. But the sole change from election of Senators by the legislatures to an election by direct vote carries with it an enlargement of power. This is that brings us face to face with the two propositions. The proposition on that side of the House is that we shall enlarge that power by limiting the amendment to the change to direct vote of the people so as to make it coequal and coextensive with the power of the Federal Government now as to the election of Members of Congress. The proposition on this side is that we should not give to the National Government the power over the election of Senators. That is the real issue clean-cut, and there can be no doubt about it.

What is the history? The history of the provision of the Constitution in regard to both Members of the House and the Senate is that it was put in there not with the idea that the Federal Government should actually supervise the manner and method of holding the election of Members of Congress or of the Senate, but that in the event of the State failing to provide the machinery and method for election, a fear that was then prominent and warranted, then the United States should exercise that power. But when the matter came to be construed as to the power in regard to Members of Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Congress of the United States had the power, without regard to the failure of the State, to regulate the method of electing Representatives to the Congress of the United States.

We in the South have had confronting us a very grave and very serious problem—a problem that, according to the best judgment of the southern people, involved the supremacy of the white race in those States. Out of much of turmoil, out of much that might not be defended in the cold forum of law,

has come now a solution that has been upheld by the courts, and that to-day is making for the future prosperity and safety of the entire land. We are not willing, many of us, to endanger that status, believing it to be most vital, by giving a power as to elections more extensive than now belongs to the Federal Government.

I am one of those men who believe that the day has gone by when we will ever see the power of the National Government enforced as it was enforced during reconstruction days; but we do not believe that it is essential to this question to augment that power and to give additional opportunity for its wrong use.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks what reason in logic can be given why a different rule should apply to the election of Members of the House and Members of the Senate. I might answer him by saying that to-day there exists a different rule in regard to the power of the Federal Government as to electors who elect a President and Members of the House of Representatives.

According to cold logic and theory, if the Federal Government should have power to control the election of Members of this House, which is necessary to its continued existence, it ought also to have power to control the election of electors who select a President of the United States, also necessary to the continuance of its existence. There is also a reason why the States in the election of Senators should not be subject to the same control that the individual election of Members is subject to. The States in selecting Senators do act in a sovereign capacity. They send Senators not simply as Members of the National Legislature, but they send them, in a sense, as ambassadors of a sovereign State, and to my mind it seems utterly foolish to say that you are willing to trust the people of the States to select these Senators, to have power to select them in the broad sense, and yet you are not willing to trust them with the arrangement of the manner and method of holding the election. Either the one position is not warranted or the other is not.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Suppose the time should come when any State should become dissatisfied with the way the Federal Government was being carried on and should refuse to provide for the election of a Senator?

Mr. SHERLEY. Frankly I say that if you gentlemen are dealing with it from that single position, men on this side of the House ought not to have, and I believe would not have, any objection to a provision that gave to the Federal Government control, predicated upon the basic fact only of the State having failed to act; but I say to you that there is no more danger to-day of the States failing to act than of any other unheard-of event.

At the time that that fear was entertained, and at the time when that fear was potent enough to put into the Constitution the provision we find there, there were many who believed the Constitution would never be ratified by the States; there were many who believed it would not last even if ratified; that the States, with their jealousy of each other, would undermine its powers; but no man to-day, after a hundred years of national existence, but realizes that the Nation as a nation is here to stay; that it will never die for failure of the component parts of it to elect Senators to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] Such a proposition is unthinkable.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question, purely for information. Does he agree with his colleague that this resolution will not be approved by the legislatures of the Southern States if this provision limiting the power of the Federal Government is not placed in it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, I have no opinion to express. In my own State we have a suffrage without limitation of any sort, and the question would not be vital there except as public opinion is influenced by public opinion in sister Southern States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have still a few minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes remaining. Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Then, I yield the remaining five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no right to speak for these States, but gentlemen have argued that we were imperiling the amendment by putting in it the provisions that we have.

I say to you that, in my judgment, it is more likely to receive the approval of the necessary States in the present form than in the form proposed in the substitute of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young]. That is simply my opinion for what it may be worth.

Mr. JACKSON. One question more, Is it fair, either to the minority party in this House or the success of this great principle for which the gentleman has been contending, to impose upon the Northern States the burden of explaining to the hundreds of thousands of colored men who do really vote the great principle which the gentleman has been endeavoring to debate here to-day? [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. My answer to the gentleman is simply this: We have on this side presented a proposition that we believe ought to be adopted. We force no man here, and can force no man, to accept our view. If a majority of the membership of this House see fit to amend this bill as the gentleman would like, well and good. I am still sufficiently in favor of the principle to vote for the constitutional amendment even in the changed form, but it is certainly as fair for us to present our proposition as it is for that side to present theirs, and I further say to the gentleman that we are not making necessary any explanation on the part of the gentleman to any person, white or black, in the North. We do not by this amendment change in one single particular the rights of the negro as a citizen of the United States. We do not in any sense interfere with the protection of those rights under the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and I would say—

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SHERLEY. I decline to yield—but we do say this, that we believe it to be unwise to give to the Federal Government an enlarged grant of power touching the manner of holding elections in the States. We do not believe that such grant of power is necessary, and we are not willing, not believing it to be necessary, to give it. There has been nothing in the history of the country that warrants the belief that it is necessary in order to preserve the Government, and that, to my mind, is the only valid reason that it should be granted.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Kentucky does not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have, as I stated, made this speech without preparation, with the consequent confusion of thought that results therefrom.

In conclusion, let me say to the membership of this House that I believe it easy for men to find excuses to vote against this amendment, but to the man who actually, sincerely, fundamentally believes that you will improve the conditions of service to be had in the Senate of the United States by putting the power of electing Senators directly in the hands of the people, to such a man I say there is nothing in the form of the amendment as offered here to-day that ought to make him pause for one moment, and to the Members on that side of the aisle, as well as on this, who actually believe, not nominally believe, in the principles of government by the people, I appeal for a support of the amendment. [Loud and continued applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement the previous question operates on the resolution and on all of the amendments. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. Young of Michigan:

Amend as follows: Strike out, on page 1, the language beginning in line 7, as follows: "And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators."

And strike out, on page 2, the language beginning in line 9, as follows:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this point, in order to save time, I will call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Young] demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not in order to vote on the substitute?

The SPEAKER. The vote will be taken on the substitute last. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendment will answer "aye," and those opposed will answer "no"; those present and not voting will answer "present."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 180, answered "present" 2, not voting 75, as follows:

YEAS—123.

Akin, N. Y.	Greene	Lenroot	Prince
Anderson, Minn.	Guernsey	Lindbergh	Prouty
Austin	Hamilton, Mich.	Loud	Rees
Barchfeld	Hanna	McCall	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Harris	McDermott	Roberts, Nev.
Berger	Hartman	McKinley	Rodenberg
Bowman	Haugen	McKinney	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Hawley	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Hayes	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Calder	Helgesen	Madden	Speer
Cannon	Henry, Conn.	Madison	Steenerson
Catlin	Hill	Malby	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Hinds	Mann	Sterling
Copley	Howell	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Howland	Matthews	Sulloway
Dalzell	Hubbard	Miller	Switzer
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Monnell	Taylor, Ohio
Davidson	Jackson	Moore, Pa.	Thistlewood
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Morgan	Townner
Dodds	Kendall	Mott	Utter
Dwight	Kennedy	Murdock	Volstead
Dyer	Kent	Needham	Warburton
Esch	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nelson	Wedemeyer
Farr	Knowland	Norris	Wildor
Fordney	Kopp	Nye	Willis
Foss	Lafean	Parran	Wilson, Ill.
Foster, Vt.	Lafferty	Patton, Pa.	Wood, N. J.
French	La Follette	Pickett	Woods, Iowa.
Fuller	Langham	Porter	Young, Kans.
Gillett	Langley	Powers	Young, Mich.
Good	Lawrence	Pray	

NAYS—180.

Adair	Dies	Jones	Roddenberg
Adamson	Difenderfer	Kindred	Rothermel
Aiken, S. C.	Dixon, Ind.	Kipp	Rubey
Alexander	Donohoe	Kitchin	Rucker, Colo.
Allen	Doremus	Konig	Rucker, Mo.
Anderson, Ohio	Doughton	Konop	Russell
Ansberry	Dupre	Korby	Sabath
Ashbrook	Edwards	Lamb	Saunders
Ayres	Falson	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Barnhart	Ferris	Lee, Pa.	Shackelford
Bartlett	Fitzgerald	Legare	Sharp
Bathrick	Flood, Va.	Lever	Sheppard
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Sherley
Bell, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Sherwood
Blackmon	Francis	Linthicum	Sims
Booher	Garner	Littlepage	Sisson
Borland	Garrett	Littleton	Slayden
Brantley	Glass	Lloyd	Small
Brown	Godwin, N. C.	Lobeck	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan	Goeke	McCoy	Sparkman
Bulkley	Goodwin, Ark.	McGillcuddy	Stanley
Burke, Wis.	Gordon	Macoon	Stedman
Burleson	Gould	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Gray	Maher	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gregg, Pa.	Martin, Colo.	Stone
Callaway	Gregg, Tex.	Mays	Sulzer
Candler	Gudger	Moon, Tenn.	Sweet
Cantrill	Hamill	Moore, Tex.	Talbot, Md.
Carlin	Hamlin	Morrison	Taylor, Ala.
Carter	Hammond	Moss, Ind.	Thayer
Clark, Fla.	Hardwick	Murray	Thomas
Claypool	Hardy	Oldfield	Townsend
Clayton	Harrison, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Tribble
Cline	Harrison, N. Y.	Padgett	Turnbull
Collier	Hay	Page	Tuttle
Connell	Helm	Patten, N. Y.	Underhill
Covington	Henry, Tex.	Pepper	Underwood
Cox, Ind.	Holland	Peters	Watkins
Cox, Ohio	Houston	Post	Whitacre
Cravens	Howard	Pou	Wickliffe
Cullop	Hughes, Ga.	Pujo	Wilson, N. Y.
Daugherty	Hughes, N. J.	Raney	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, W. Va.	Hull	Raker	Witherspoon
Dent	Humphreys, Miss.	Randall, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Denver	Jacoway	Rauch	The Speaker
Dickinson	James	Reilly	
Dickson, Miss.	Johnson, Ky.	Richardson	
	Johnson, S. C.	Robinson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Cary Kinkaid, N. J.

NOT VOTING—75.

Ames	Burke, Pa.	Driscoll, D. A.	Fornes
Andrus	Campbell	Driscoll, M. E.	Fowler
Anthony	Conry	Ellerbe	Gallagher
Bates	Crumpacker	Estopinal	Gardner, Mass.
Bingham	Curley	Evans	Gardner, N. J.
Boehme	Currier	Fairchild	George
Bradley	Davenport	Fields	Goldfogle
Broussard	De Forest	Finley	Graham
Burgess	Draper	Focht	Griest

Hamilton, W. Va.	Loudenslager	Payne	Smith, N. Y.
Heald	McCreary	Plumley	Stack
Healin	McGuire, Okla.	Ransdell, La.	Talcott, N. Y.
Hensley	McHenry	Redfield	Taylor, Colo.
Higgins	McKenzie	Riordan	Tilson
Hobson	Mitchell	Rouse	Vreeland
Hughes, W. Va.	Moon, Pa.	Sells	Webb
Latta	Morse, Wis.	Simmons	Weeks
Lindsay	Olmsted	Slomp	White
Longworth	Palmer	Smith, Cal.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDREUS.

Until further notice:

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. STACK with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. HEALD.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. KINKADE of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. DRAPER.

From April 6 to April 14, inclusive:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. WEEKS.

From April 11 to April 14, noon:

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. MCCREARY.

Until Monday, April 17:

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. BATES.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

For this vote:

Mr. CURLEY (against) with Mr. DE FOREST (in favor).

Mr. GEORGE (against) with Mr. ANTHONY (in favor).

Mr. ROUSE (against) with Mr. GRIEST (in favor).

Mr. CONRY (against) with Mr. SELLS (in favor).

Mr. ELLERBE (against) with Mr. CAMPBELL (in favor).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CARY:

On page 8 add: "That there be and there is hereby proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become effective as a part of the Constitution, as follows:

"That there be, and there is hereby, proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become and be effective as part of the Constitution, as follows:

"Sec. 1. Members and Delegates to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall be elected after the passage of this bill for a term of four years.

"Sec. 2. Said election shall take place at the time and on the day prescribed by law for the casting of the popular vote for President of the United States, and in the manner prescribed by law by the different States and Territories."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. MANN:

Amend page 2, line 4, by inserting after the word "by" the following, "a direct vote of."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, also offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, lines 7 and 8, by striking out the word "legislatures" and inserting the word "legislature."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe I would like to see the gentleman from Illinois gain one victory in this contest, and I therefore hope this amendment will be accepted. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "that the legislature of any State may empower," and, in line 16, by striking out the word "to" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, also by Mr. MANN.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 18, by striking out the words "so" and "as."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America, the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:

"Sec. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate, the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph 1: Provided, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State."

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. The yeas and nays!

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the membership of this House here by calling for the yeas and nays, because I believe the House is practically a unit on this measure. But if gentlemen want a ye-and-nay vote, there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 16, answered "present" 0, not voting 77, as follows:

YEAS—206.

Adair	Burleson	Davis, Minn.	Glass
Adamson	Burnett	Davis, W. Va.	Godwin, N. C.
Aiken, S. C.	Butler	Dent	Goeke
Akin, N. Y.	Byrnes, S. C.	Denver	Good
Alexander	Byrns, Tenn.	Dickinson	Goodwin, Ark.
Allen	Calder	Dickson, Miss.	Gordon
Anderson, Minn.	Callaway	Dies	Gould
Anderson, Ohio	Candler	Difenderfer	Gray
Ansberry	Cantrill	Dixon, Ind.	Greene
Ashbrook	Carlin	Donohoe	Gregg, Pa.
Austin	Carter	Doremus	Gregg, Tex.
Ayres	Cary	Doughton	Gudger
Barchfeld	Catlin	Dupre	Guernsey
Barnhart	Clark, Fla.	Dyer	Hamill
Bartholdt	Claypool	Edwards	Hamilton, Mich.
Bartlett	Clayton	Esch	Hamlin
Bathrick	Cline	Faison	Hammond
Beall, Tex.	Collier	Farr	Hanna
Bell, Ga.	Connell	Ferris	Hardwick
Berger	Cooper	Fitzgerald	Hardy
Blackmon	Copley	Flood, Va.	Harrison, Miss.
Boober	Covington	Floyd, Ark.	Harrison, N. Y.
Borland	Cox, Ind.	Foss	Hartman
Bowman	Cox, Ohio	Foster, Ill.	Haugen
Brantley	Crago	Foster, Vt.	Hawley
Brown	Cravens	Francis	Hay
Buchanan	Cullop	French	Hayes
Bulkley	Dalzell	Fuller	Helgesen
Burke, S. Dak.	Daugherty	Garner	Helm
Burke, Wis.	Davidson	Garrett	Henry, Conn.

Henry, Tex.	Levy	Patton, Pa.	Smith, Tex.
Hill	Lewis	Pepper	Sparkman
Holland	Lindbergh	Peters	Speer
Houston	Linthicum	Pickett	Stanley
Howard	Littlepage	Porter	Stedman
Howell	Littleton	Post	Steenerson
Howland	Lloyd	Pou	Stephens, Cal.
Hubbard	Lobeck	Powers	Stephens, Miss.
Hughes, Ga.	Loud	Pray	Stephens, Tex.
Hughes, N. J.	McCoy	Prince	Sterling
Hull	McGillcuddy	Prouty	Stone
Humphrey, Wash.	McKinley	Pujo	Sulzer
Humphreys, Miss.	McKinney	Rainey	Sweet
Jackson	McLaughlin	Raker	Switzer
Jacoway	Macon	Randell, Tex.	Talbot, Md.
James	Madden	Rauch	Taylor, Ala.
Johnson, Ky.	Madison	Rees	Taylor, Ohio
Johnson, S. C.	Maguire, Nebr.	Reilly	Thayer
Jones	Maher	Richardson	Thomas
Kahn	Martin, Colo.	Roberts, Mass.	Towner
Kendall	Martin, S. Dak.	Roberts, Nev.	Townsend
Kennedy	Matthews	Robinson	Tribble
Kent	Mays	Roddenberry	Turnbull
Kindred	Miller	Roddenberg	Tuttle
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Mondell	Rothermel	Underhill
Kinkaid, N. J.	Moon, Tenn.	Ruby	Underwood
Kipp	Moore, Pa.	Rucker, Colo.	Volstead
Kitchin	Moore, Tex.	Rucker, Mo.	Warburton
Knowland	Morgan	Russell	Watkins
Konig	Morrison	Sabath	Wedemeyer
Konop	Moss, Ind.	Saunders	Whitacre
Kopp	Mott	Scully	White
Korbly	Murdock	Shackleford	Wickliffe
Lafean	Murray	Sharp	Willis
Lafferty	Needham	Sheppard	Wilson, Ill.
La Follette	Nelson	Sherley	Wilson, N. Y.
Lamb	Norris	Sherwood	Wilson, Pa.
Langham	Nye	Sims	Witherspoon
Langley	Oldfield	Sisson	Wood, N. J.
Lee, Ga.	O'Shaunessy	Slaydon	Woods, Iowa
Lee, Pa.	Padgett	Sloan	Young, Kans.
Legare	Page	Small	Young, Mich.
Lenroot	Parran	Smith, J. M. C.	Young, Tex.
Lever	Patten, N. Y.	Smith, Saml. W.	The Speaker

NAYS—16.

Cannon	Fordney	McCall	Mann
Danforth	Harris	McDermott	Sulloway
Dodds	Hinds	McMorrin	Utter
Dwight	Lawrence	Malby	Wilder

NOT VOTING—77.

Ames	Ellerbe	Hensley	Redfield
Andrus	Estopinal	Higgins	Riordan
Anthony	Evans	Hobson	Rouse
Bates	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Sells
Bingham	Fields	Latta	Simmons
Boehne	Finley	Lindsay	Slemp
Bradley	Focht	Longworth	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Fornes	Loudenslager	Smith, N. Y.
Burgess	Fowler	McCreary	Stack
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell	Gardner, Mass.	McHenry	Talcott, N. Y.
Conry	Gardner, N. J.	McKenzie	Taylor, Colo.
Crumpacker	George	Mitchell	Thistlewood
Curley	Gillett	Moon, Pa.	Tilson
Currier	Goldfogle	Morse	Vreeland
Davenport	Graham	Olmsted	Webb
De Forest	Griest	Palmer	Weeks
Draper	Hamilton, W. Va.	Payne	
Driscoll, D. A.	Heald	Plumley	
Driscoll, M. E.	Hefflin	Ransdell, La.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So (two-thirds voting in the affirmative) the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. DE FOREST.

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. GILLETT.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LATTA, for three weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. RUSSELL, for three days, on account of illness.

To Mr. HENSLEY, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. LONGWORTH, for three days, on account of important business.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is half past 7 o'clock, and I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 14, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examinations of channel connecting Red and Sulphur Rivers, Arkansas and Texas (H. Doc. No. 12), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. A bill (H. R. 4641) to make immediately available the \$25,000 appropriation authorized by the sundry civil act of the third session, Sixty-first Congress, for additional office work in the office of the surveyors general; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4642), to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4643) to establish a mussel hatchery and fish-cultural station on the Wabash River in the fifth congressional district of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4644) to pay the balance due depositors in the Freedman's Savings and Trust Co.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4645) to make it unlawful for certain Federal officeholders to serve as delegates in a convention called to nominate a President of the United States or other elective United States officers; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) for the purpose of exempting lime nitrogen, an agricultural fertilizer, from import duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Florence, Ala., to Gen. John Coffee; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 4648) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4649) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4650) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, the building formerly used as United States post office, courthouse, and customhouse; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4651) in relation to restraining orders and injunctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) to repeal the duty on coal and coal slack or culm; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) to repeal the duty on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) to repeal the duty on bitumen and asphaltum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) to provide for the erection of an Army and Navy hospital at Marlin, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Belton, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4660), to restore the merchant marine in the foreign trade, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to overcome the disadvantages of American navigation, to make preference for American ships in export trade, to put the postal service by sea under general regulations, to put an end to foreign monopoly of our over-sea commerce, and to secure American independence on the ocean; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4661) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 4662) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4663) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to adopt uniform rules for the operation of railroad trains and to use a uniform system of signals for authorizing the movement of railroad trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 4664) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 4665) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Elyria, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4666) to establish a national memorial home for aged and infirm colored people and working girls in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4667) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4668) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) relating to the naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Palo Alto, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) for the enlargement of the Federal building at San Jose, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) extending the limits of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) to amend the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindus, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race, and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) to provide for the erection of a lighthouse on Pilar Point, at the entrance to Half Moon Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 4681) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of New York; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4682) authorizing the construction of a railroad, tramroad, conveyor, wagon, or foot bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Glenhayes Station, in Wayne County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4683) to authorize the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Crow Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands therein, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) to provide an additional district judge for the district of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) to amend section 1 of the act of May 30, 1908, entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4686) for the preservation of the 29 Doric columns taken from the east side of the United States Treasury Building, and their erection in the form of a colonnade, stadium, or amphitheater for the ornamentation of Potomac Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEVY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4687) to amend the act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4688) in relation to contempt of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 4689) to provide for the erection of a public building at Montgomery, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beckley, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) to provide for the erection of a public building at St. Albans, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the erection of a public building at Roncove, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 4694) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the children's bureau; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4695) to authorize the sale of burnt timber on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4696) granting pensions to widows of soldiers and sailors who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served more than 90 days in the military or naval service of the United States in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4698) authorizing States and Territories to select lands in lieu of lands included within forest reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4699) providing for the compensation of States and Territories for lands included within forest reserves; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 4700) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon or mortars to the State armory, Pittston, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4701) to provide for the erection of a public building at New Braunfels, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4702) to provide for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the United States Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 4703) to establish a department in the Congressional Library for the purpose of gathering and indexing statute-law material and legal material of a comparative nature, and to provide for draftsmen for congressional measures, and to otherwise assist and aid Members of Congress and public officials; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for a continuing contract for the construction, repair, and preservation of public work on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4705) to establish a National Memorial Home for aged and infirm colored people and for working girls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4706) granting to the city of Los Angeles certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands and national forests in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 4707) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Chariton, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4708) to regulate the rank of staff officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4709) to repeal the appropriation for the reconstruction of certain improvements at the Edgemoor Lighthouse Depot, Del., \$30,000, found on page 77 of the act of March 4, 1911, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers to \$90 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of West Point, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) to construct a road from Fort McPherson, Ga., to the rifle range and military reservation near Waco, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase part of the McIntosh Reservation, in Carroll County, Ga., and erect a monument thereon; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 4715) to amend "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, so as to place certain necessities of life on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 4716) for the relief of certain counties in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 4717) authorizing an investigation with a view to securing allotments for the Choctaws of Mississippi and Seminoles of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4718) to authorize the use of certain unclaimed moneys now in the registry of the United States circuit court for the northern district of Ohio for the improvement of the libraries of the United States courts for said district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 4719) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to allot and assign a space in the chapel of the United States Naval Academy for a memorial window; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4720) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Fostoria, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Crestline, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 4722) to provide for the building of a public avenue on the south side of the Potomac River from the city of Washington to Mount Vernon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) to provide the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and National Guard with a suitable rifle range for small-arms practice near Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) to provide for a new superstructure for the Aqueduct Bridge across the Potomac River and to lay thereon a concrete floor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4726) relating to bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 4727) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Anacostia River, or Eastern Branch, and lands adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4728) authorizing a resurvey of township 11 north, range 8, west of the fifth principal meridian, in Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4729) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and educational or eleemosynary institutions arising from the late Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Beaufort, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery carriers of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4732) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station at Canyon City, Randall County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) for acquiring national forests at the headwaters of Red River, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 82) to amend Rule X of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolution (H. Res. 83) to amend paragraph 4 of Rule XXVI; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 84) requesting certain data from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: Resolution (H. Res. 85) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish certain information as to places as to which authorization or appropriation has been made for a public building or a site for a public building, by legislation of the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, or Sixty-first Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) directing the Secretary of War to sell certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) to provide for the transportation by sea of men, material, stores, and equipment for account of the United States, and of material, stores, and equipment for use in the construction or maintenance of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to amend joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission in relation to universal peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of the Legislature of Tennessee, urging return of direct cotton tax, etc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Tennessee, urging a constitutional amendment prohibiting practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 4735) granting an increase of pension to William J. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) granting an increase of pension to Conrad C. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4737) for the relief of Mary Perkinson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) for the relief of H. T. Cunningham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) for the relief of the heirs of Willis Miller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) for the relief of the estate of Dolly Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry S. Callier, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. L. Gordon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) to compensate P. K. Leathers for services rendered the United States in the prosecution of William T. Head and others in the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) to compensate the legal representatives of Henry S. Castellow for stock and provisions taken for the use of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) to compensate W. T. Godwin for transportation, rent, and supplies furnished United States authorities engaged in suppressing a riot in Harris County, Ga., in 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4746) granting an increase of pension to George H. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4747) granting an increase of pension to Michael McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) granting a pension to Oliver Milroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) granting a pension to Lewis Kingseed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) granting a pension to Isaac K. Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) granting a pension to William Bensing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4752) granting an increase of pension to George Coffet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4753) granting an increase of pension to Curtis C. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Westhafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) granting an increase of pension to John Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4756) granting an increase of pension to John S. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Grosseup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) granting an increase of pension to William Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 4760) for the relief of Nancy E. Latimer, executrix of the estate of D. E. Knoles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4761) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4762) for the relief of Hiram Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of Hiram Smith and John R. W. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) for the relief of John H. Chapman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) granting an increase of pension to James Uphold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4766) granting a pension to Dora Dee Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) granting a pension to Ernest E. Pearsall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of the estate of Simon Brown, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph G. Thorpe, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Michael De Loach; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of heirs of Elizabeth T. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of John H. Ruddell, administrator of the estate of Reuben R. Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4773) for the relief of W. W. Weekley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4774) for the relief of A. R. Speaks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of the heirs of T. B. Fripp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of James T. Dowling; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) for the relief of Pierson Peebles; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4778) for the relief of the heirs of Allen Fanning, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) for the relief of the trustees of Columbia Baptist Church; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) for the relief of Harmony Lodge, No. 17, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, at Barnwell, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of Great Salkehatchie Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) for the relief of Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) for the relief of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) for the relief of the estate of John Fripp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) for the relief of the estate of Stephen A. Kittles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) for the relief of the estate of Richard N. Kittles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) for the relief of Miss Evalina A. E. Fripp; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4788) granting an increase of pension to George R. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay arrearage to Thomas F. Haywood, Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4790) granting a pension to Dora E. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 4791) for the relief of the heirs of David R. Hubbard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) for relief of estate of Marcus Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Church of Kossuth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Christian Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Presbyterian Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 4798) granting a pension to William A. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) granting a pension to Elmer E. Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4800) for the relief of estate of Amos Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) for the relief of the trustees of Back Lick Church, now known as the Beulah Baptist Church, of Franconia, Fairfax County, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Second Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4803) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Harry V. Hoes, administrator of Theodore Hoes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4804) granting an increase of pension to George W. Van De Bogert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4805) granting an increase of pension to Palmer Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4806) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hamacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) granting an increase of pension to John Jeffries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) granting an increase of pension to John H. Leasure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) granting an increase of pension to John Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) granting an increase of pension to Richard T. Stott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Albert Shaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Dalzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) granting an increase of pension to Harvey McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) granting an increase of pension to Almon G. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) granting an increase of pension to William Petrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) granting an increase of pension to John Snay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 4822) granting an increase of pension to George Claxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) granting an increase of pension to Florida Kennerly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Hepps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4825) granting a pension to William L. Woestendiek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) for the relief of the heirs of Jackson Grooms; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) for the relief of Bartholomew Buckley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) for the relief of John H. Drosselmeier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4829) to correct the military record of Allen Barnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of Dr. C. D. Royall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) for the relief of the heirs of Francis M. Stone; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) for the relief of the heirs of Francis H. McLeod; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) for the relief of the estate of C. Royal, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4834) granting a pension to Sarah J. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 4835) granting pension to James E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 4836) granting an increase of pension to George H. Ruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 4837) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Fones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 4838) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas Leathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Lawry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) granting an increase of pension to Eliakiam Byard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) granting an increase of pension to Adna T. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) granting an increase of pension to James R. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) granting an increase of pension to Boardman C. Friend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) granting a pension to George N. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 4847) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) granting a pension to I. G. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) granting an increase of pension to Philip Ehresman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of Mrs. Mary W. Bailey, W. A. Jordan, Mrs. M. E. Turlington, and Ephram J. Jordan, heirs of Ephram J. Jordan, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4851) granting a pension to Charles A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) granting a pension to Charles A. Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of Jeremiah C. Conkling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) for the relief of Thomas P. Curren; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Bishop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of certain officers of the Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4858) granting an increase of pension to William E. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) granting a pension to Morinthia Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting a pension to Sophronia Beverly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) for the relief of Nancy E. Wright, heir of Melvil Wilkerson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) for the relief of Nancy Pierson, widow, and the heirs of John Hogue Pierson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of W. A. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) for the relief of the heirs of James Tandy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Senter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel F. Ryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4867) granting an increase of pension to Sue E. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Plybon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) granting an increase of pension to Andy Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) granting a pension to Henderson Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) granting a pension to Emily Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) granting a pension to Electra Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of James Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4875) granting an increase of pension to Charles Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to Clark Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 4877) granting a pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) granting a pension to James A. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to Thomas KeChittigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) granting an increase of pension to Joshua B. Hartzog; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) granting an increase of pension to Frank La Flame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) granting a pension to Anna Melstrup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4885) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Byron F. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 4887) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hugg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) granting a pension to James Murray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4889) granting an increase of pension to James Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4892) for the relief of Frederick Leser, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Claypool; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4894) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4895) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) granting an increase of pension to Gustav Lenau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to William T. Bowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Munson M. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 4901) granting a pension to George W. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) granting a pension to Francis M. Wall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4903) for the relief of heirs or estate of Thomas Washington Tompkins, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4904) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) granting an increase of pension to George P. McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4907) granting an increase of pension to William C. Armor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) granting an increase of pension to Warren G. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4909) granting an increase of pension to James Chaplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kersey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting an increase of pension to James W. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting an increase of pension to Cealon Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Levsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan K. Rollins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gulliford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Beshore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting an increase of pension to Cicero Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. La Boyteaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting a pension to Clement Holderman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) granting a pension to Etta Cronin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) granting a pension to Fillmore Pettyford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) granting a pension to Mary J. Brophy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) granting a pension to Robert A. Talbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Edward F. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) for the relief of Frank Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) to correct the military record of Joseph Elshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) authorizing the payment of a claim to Tollivar B. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 4931) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Mullens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to August Brockmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) granting an increase of pension to George D. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Klammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Layman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) granting an increase of pension to William Redus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4939) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4940) granting an increase of pension to Robert Barbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) granting an increase of pension to E. G. Falkner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) granting an increase of pension to William Carroll McKinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) granting a pension to Mary T. Parrish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) granting a pension to J. L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) granting a pension to Bettie Brock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting a pension to Albert M. Geiger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting a pension to John E. Sanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting a pension to Sandy G. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) granting a pension to Doc L. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting a pension to John S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) granting a pension to Joseph Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4956) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4957) granting a pension to Julia Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4958) granting a pension to Louisa Margaret Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting a pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4960) granting a pension to James M. Hankins and William M. Hankins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting a pension to Robert Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting a pension to Moses A. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) granting a pension to David R. Bellomy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) granting a pension to Isaac N. Bynum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to James A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4967) granting a pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting a pension to Louisa Margaret Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) granting a pension to Julia Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) granting a pension to Levi P. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) granting a pension to Samuel Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) granting a pension to Nancy Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) granting a pension to Mary A. Precise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) granting a pension to S. F. Kennamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) granting a pension to Henry Pullam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) granting a pension to Elizabeth McKinn Friar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) for the relief of William M. Underwood; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) for the relief of Mary B. Dancy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Cribbs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) for the relief of James Eli Schrimsher; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) for the relief of Bettie Linder, administratrix of B. Franks, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) for the relief of B. G. Chandler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) for the relief of B. F. Ludwig; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) for the relief of Sallie C. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) for the relief of Stephen Fanning; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) for the relief of William M. Hilliard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4989) for the relief of William C. Bragg; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Raney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) for the relief of Elisha Stogsdill; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) for the relief of Mary J. Bailey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and estate of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of Bathsheba Gordon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) for the relief of William W. Callahan, administrator of the estate of Thomas Gibbs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of John Smaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of John W. McAfee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) for the relief of John T. Lehman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pleasant Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) for the relief of James A. Allen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) for the relief of James Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and heirs of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) for the relief of Jonathan Morris, executor of Jonathan Morris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) for the relief of R. D. Crosthwaite, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) for the relief of Mary Tullis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) for the relief of Littleton McCloud and Bill Mull; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) for the relief of James T. Dowdy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) for the relief of Martha J. Sibley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) for the relief of Thomas W. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) for the relief of John T. Graves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of James Henry and Porter Henry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) for the relief of George M. Harraway; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) for the relief of Mattie P. Barnard, Katharine Caldwell, and Henry M. Rhett, heirs of Harriett M. Barnard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Trousdale; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) for the relief of Nancy M. Weaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) for the relief of Samuel W. Shackelford, trustee of Susan A. Shackelford; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) for the relief of Dan Walden; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) for the relief of Mattie H. Ligon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) for the relief of J. W. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) for the relief of the trustees of the Chestnut Grove Church, in Morgan County, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Vann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) for the relief of the executor or administrator of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) for the relief of W. C. Tipton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) for the relief of John C. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5029) for the relief of Houston L. Bell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5030) for the relief of Nancy Coffey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) for the relief of John T. Graves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) for the relief of Griffin Callahan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5033) for the relief of Dr. Ira G. Wood; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5034) for the relief of Francis Wilkes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5035) for the relief of J. W. Smart; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) for the relief of Phillip D. Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) for the relief of Mrs. Cassa Simpson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) for the relief of William Cunningham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) for the relief of B. F. Hembree; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) for the relief of Alfred O. Williamson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) for the relief of James G. Porter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of Boling King; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Herstein, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) for the relief of heirs of J. P. McGaha, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) for the relief of heirs of Lemuel Hannah, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) for the relief of heirs of Josiah White, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) for the relief of heirs of Andrew C. Legg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of heirs of Mathew N. Grimmett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) for the relief of heirs of Elizabeth Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of heirs of Benjamin Lawler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5052) for the relief of heirs of J. R. B. Eldridge, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) for the relief of heirs of Kennon H. Steger, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) for the relief of heirs of Thomas Knight, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) for the relief of heirs of James H. Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5056) for the relief of heirs of Enoch R. and Louisa J. Kennedy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) for the relief of heirs of Preston Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) for the relief of heirs of Andrew J. Peacock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) for the relief of heirs of Joseph Logan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) for the relief of heirs of Sidney Tate, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) for the relief of heirs of Alfred Hambrick, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) for the relief of heirs of Alexander F. Perryman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) for the relief of heirs of William Wann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) for the relief of heirs of W. J. Langston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) for the relief of heirs of Sarah Schrimsher; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) for the relief of heirs of Mary McCaa, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) for the relief of the heirs of A. E. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) for the relief of the heirs of Elliah Matheny; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) for the relief of the heirs of Jane McCartney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of heirs or estates of Elbert H. and Melinda Ellett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of the estate of Joseph A. Martin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) for the relief of the estate of Enoch R. Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) for the relief of the estate of John Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Snodgrass; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) for the relief of the estate of W. W. McCrary; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Melissa Gathright, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Hambrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of the estate of James Williams, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of the estate of Bradford Hambrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) for the relief of the estate of John Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Knight, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) for the relief of the estate of John Walston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of the estate of Mathew N. Grimmett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Coffey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of the estate of William P. Tanner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ingram, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. G. Mason, administrator of estates of Glorvinia Mason, and John O. Mason, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of David B. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of the legal heirs of James I. Donegan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) to refer the claim of Nancy Taylor against the United States to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) to refer the claim against the United States of the heirs of Fabian Varin to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to Alford J. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to John J. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting a pension to James Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting a pension to Richard A. Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting a pension to John Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5104) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Hamman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McQuate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting an increase of pension to Charles Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting a pension to Estella M. Manville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) granting a pension to Lydia L. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) granting a pension to Hannah M. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) granting a pension to Delilah Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) granting a pension to Austin L. Straub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Charles J. Pfahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5115) granting a pension to Jerry R. Daniel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) for the relief of R. R. Russell, Irve W. Ellis, J. L. Borroun, N. H. Corder, and Wooten & Vashinder; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5117) to pay the claim of Mrs. Charles H. Benson, of San Antonio, Tex., for damages done to her phaeton by a caisson of the Third Regiment United States Field Artillery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) to pay Henry Fink for the loss of a horse killed by United States soldiers while at target practice; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Harris L. Roberts, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting an increase of pension to Archibald McLain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Manchester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) granting an increase of pension to Philip Gavin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5124) granting an increase of pension to William H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 5125) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 5126) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Clement Lamoureux; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 5127) granting an increase of pension to John Tidball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lusk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) granting a pension to Clara S. Ickis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 5130) granting a pension to Teresa Mindermann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5131) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Crants; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Fogarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5134) granting a pension to Henry D. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5135) to correct the military record of John J. Troxell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5136) granting an increase of pension to Peter Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Paper to accompany bill for increase of pension for George H. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of E. D. Rutledge & Co. and 7 other business men of Minerva, Ohio, in opposition to the

parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWN: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Hiram Smith and John R. W. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Petition of Dr. G. Caruso and other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the tariff on Italian lemons, and requesting that they be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of citizens of Upper Uwchlan, East Nautmeal, West Vincent, and Wallace Townships, of Pennsylvania, relative to cold storage of food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of George R. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: Protest by the Auxiliary of the Postal Clerks of Kendallville, Ind., relative to the condition of men employed in the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of Niagara Alkali Co. for imposition of an import duty on caustic potash, and of the New York Cordage Co. as to duty on cotton bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of R. G. Dakan, A. H. Gray, and others, with reference to the duty on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of J. F. Ligman and others, of Independence, Wis., favoring election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and in favor of retention of present duty on barley and on oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Homer G. Sell, of Hillsdale, Ill., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., for a general old-age pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in Interior Department.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of Congregational and Baptist Churches of Merrimac, Mass., for the passage of the bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquor in all Government buildings; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Congregational and Baptist Churches of Merrimac, Mass., for passage of Burkett-Sims bill to forbid interstate transmission of race-gambling odds and bets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Amherst Grange, No. 16, Patrons of Husbandry, of Amherst, Mass., opposing passage of tariff agreement bill with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of residents of Lancaster, Pa., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolutions of Highland Grange, No. 364, Patrons of Husbandry, of Penobscot, Me., protesting against the passage of the reciprocity measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Bolton Grange, No. 47, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bolton, Conn., in behalf of an improved parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of West Hartford Grange, No. 69, Patrons of Husbandry, of West Hartford, Conn., against the enactment of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Protest of H. J. Bishop and 52 other citizens of Jasper County, Iowa, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of numerous citizens of Appleton, Wis., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of E. L. Phillips and others, of New Bethlehem, Pa., in opposition to the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of numerous citizens of Cokato, Minn., and farmers and business men of Brandon, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Crow Wing County, Minn.; against Anglo-American alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles M. Kuhr, against sending troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petitions of the Seward Republican Club, of New York; the Union League Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and the New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Pa., to withdraw the troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Resolutions of the electors of Sand Beach Township, Huron County, Mich., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of citizens of Moreland and citizens of Ames, Okla., requesting withdrawal of United States troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolutions of Three Mile Bay Grange, No. 126, of Three Mile Bay; Port Leyden Grange, No. 1037; Lower Oswego Falls Grange, of Fulton, N. Y.; River Bank Grange, No. 534, of River Bank; Granby Grange, of Granby; Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 349, of Mount Pleasant; Depauville Grange, No. 59; and Denmark Grange, No. 535, of Denmark, Patrons of Husbandry, all of the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of George W. Burgess and other citizens of the town of Granby, Oswego County; the Dilts Machine Works, of Fulton; Oxbow Grange, No. 691, of Oxbow; Orwell Grange, No. 66, of Orwell; Point Peninsula Grange, No. 1030, of Point Peninsula; Pamela Grange, No. 68, of Pamela; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, of Sandy Creek; Redwood Grange, No. 684, of Redwood; Phoenix Grange, No. 9, of Phoenix; West Monroe Grange, of West Monroe; and of Glenfield Grange, No. 548, of Glenfield, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y.; Albion Center Grange, No. 270, of Albion, N. Y.; and Chaumont Grange, No. 855, of Chaumont, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry; Carthage Board of Trade, of Carthage, N. Y.; B. W. Bennett, of Fulton, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of The Gleaners, a Sunday-school class of the Methodist Episcopal Society; the Women's Missionary Society and the Progressive Men's Class of the Methodist Episcopal Society, of Rockingham and other towns; the combined Women's Missionary Societies of the churches of Bellows Falls, constituting about 500 persons in said Rockingham, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill, so called, prohibiting saloons in Hawaii, and the McCumber-Terrell bill, so called, concerning the opium trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against the proposed reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against increase of magazine postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the Empire Company, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fletcher, Miami County, Ohio, to pass more stringent laws for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Hunt County, Tex., requesting immediate withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of citizens of Sheffield, Pa., for the immediate recall of United States troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Toledo Lodge, International Association of Machinists, of Toledo, Ohio, urging illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Greenwood Grange; Highland Grange, No. 22, of Catharine, Schuyler County; Stephens Mills, Fremont; Woodhull Grange, of Woodhull; Canisteo Grange, No. 400, of Canisteo; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 408, of Urbana; Oak Hill Grange, No. 574, of South Dansville; Bath Grange, No. 294, of Bath; Romulus Grange, No. 1181, of Romulus; Caton Grange, No. 248, of Caton; Jasper Grange, No. 619; Avoca Grange, No. 176, of Avoca; Howard Grange, No. 976, of Howell; Chemung Valley Grange, No. 57, of Elmira; Lodi Grange, No. 213, of Lodi; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846, of Hornell; and Towlesville Grange, No. 430, all of the State of New York, against proposed reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Union League Club of New York, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Resolutions of Leopold Zung Lodge, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, located at Goldsboro, N. C., asking that all Senators and Members of Congress aid in the passage of any resolutions which call for the modification or abrogation of all treaty relations with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by board of officers of Second Regiment, National Guard of New Jersey, urging passage of bill providing for pay for the Organized Militia of United States; to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Somerset Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Middlebush, N. J., against passage of any measure restricting to a period of three months the maximum time for the cold storage of staple foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of S. T. McDonald and other veterans of the Civil War, of Rosewood, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Sherwood pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 14, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion I am unable to hear what the Clerk is reading. It is not the fault of the Clerk. What is he reading?

The SPEAKER. He is supposed to be reading the Journal. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Has there been a demand made that the Journal shall be read in full, rather than a statement? If so, does that include the reading of the names of Members who voted?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was not reading the names of Members who voted.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care at this time to demand the reading of the names. Of course I could, but it seems to me an exceedingly long Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was reading the Journal in the usual way and will proceed.

The Clerk completed the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER announced the following change of reference: A bill (H. R. 2900) to authorize the acceptance by the United States of the gift of the Nathan Straus Pasteurized Milk Laboratory; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for a committee to investigate the method of enforcement of the antitrust act and other matters; Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice discharged, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

PRINTING RESOLUTIONS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print the following resolution in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a certain memorial, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution asking for an investigation of the Taylor system of shop management.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa, one of the able new Members of the House, is probably not familiar with the practice of the House, which is not to print memorials in the Record. If it is once begun there is no limit, and if once begun the Record becomes so bulky that we never can find the thing we want on account of the number of memorials.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if this is a memorial or a resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. It is a resolution.